MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

8 JULY 1981

Lebanese Crisis

Military Situation--Damascus radio quoted a Syrian military spokesman as saying Arab Deterrent Forces (ADF) downed an Israeli drone overflying their positions in Lebanon. According to Voice of Lebanon radio, the plane was hit by fire from Al-Masna' and crashed in the western part of the Al-Biqa' valley. Jerusalem Radio cited an IDF spokesman as saying the drone crashed because of a technical problem. Reporting on the security situation in Beirut, the Voice of Lebanon said sniper fire has effectively closed the road linking eastern and western Beirut through Sodeco gate. Beirut radio reported that an Israeli commando unit clashed with Irish UNIFIL forces at dawn on 8 July while attempting to infiltrate a southern town. Jerusalem radio reported a clash between Irish troops and two gangs of armed men.

Phalangist-Israeli Relations--The Voice of Lebanon reported that after meeting with President Ilyas Sarkis, Phalangist leader Shaykh Pierre al-Jumayyil said his party is willing to guarantee that it will have no relations with Israel in order to end the uproar over the issue, which opponents of the Phalangists have exploited in the recent fighting in eastern Lebanon. Asserting that his party's relations with Israel go no further than the purchase of arms for self-defense, Al-Jumayyil indicated that the Phalangists would only be willing to forego their own arms if other factions in Lebanon are disarmed as well. Calling for a discussion of the situation in southern Lebanon, "which we cannot tackle without dealing with the Palestinian problem," the Phalangist leader said his side wants an honest solution guaranteeing its sovereignty, liberty and dignity.

A Damascus radio commentary reiterated Syria's insistence that the Lebanese crisis cannot be solved without an end to Israeli-Phalangist relations, saying the establishment of security and accord in the Lebanese "House" is impossible if its "doors and windows" are open to the enemy. The radio said the last Arab followup committee meeting at Bayt ad-Din Palace failed to achieve the desired results because of the intransigence of the Phalangist "isolationist forces," who want to abort the followup committee's mission by making it view discussions with them as futile and who wish to exploit the time factor in order to strengthen their hand with the "Israeli backing they have been promised," awaiting a suitable opportunity to disrupt the security situation and implement their partition schemes. While Syria wants the next followup committee meeting to be successful, the radio said, it warns the Phalangists of the consequences of their continued failure to announce the termination of their dealings with Israel. Damascus radio also quoted ATH-THAWRAH as saying on 8 July that an end to the Israeli presence in Lebanon means the termination of Israeli contacts with "agents or Zionist spies present on certain Lebanese side."

Habib Mission, SAM Missiles--The Syrian daily TISHRIN, reviewed by Damascus radio, said Syria's stand will not change during U.S. special envoy Philip Habib's forthcoming third tour of the region and asserted that if Habib has been successful in postponing a military conflict, his success has been achieved through influencing Israel's stand and not Syria's. According to SANA AL-BA'TH said that Syria's SAM missiles will stay on Lebanese soil as long as Israel stays there and that Syria will reinforce these missiles with "various types of sophisticated arms" that will enable the Arabs to stand fast against Israel. According to Jerusalem radio, Prime Minister Menahem Begin's media adviser has denied a report carried by the major U.S. television networks that Begin has given 2 weeks to U.S. envoy Habib to settle the Syrian missile crisis before Israel destroys the missiles. The radio said the erroneous report stemmed from Begin's remarks that he was amazed that Habib was delaying his return to the Middle East for 2 weeks and that the U.S. envoy should not have adjourned his talks for such an extended period.

Multinational Peacekeeping Force

Jerusalem radio reported that Israeli Prime Minister Begin conferred with Michael Sterner, U.S. representative to the talks on the Sinai multination force, on the draft agreement. According to the radio, all of the prime minister's requests for amendment of various clauses, particularly the one concerning the status of the multinational force and the possibilities of its removal, have been accepted. In a related report, Cairo radio said Egyptian Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali met with the U.S. ambassador to Cairo to discuss the formation of the peacekeeping force.

Iran

Musavi Interview--In an interview broadcast by Tehran radio, Foreign Minister Hoseyn Musavi said that in the past 2 years the post of foreign minister has been used as a means to gain power in the country and that consequently the Foreign Ministry is now disorganized. He said he will try to create a united and coordinated organization within the ministry. Musavi also said embassy staffs in Western countries will be reduced since Iran will be giving priority to Islamic, Middle East and oppressed countries.

Executions, Arrests--Tehran radio reported that nine people were executed in various cities for antigovernment activities. According to Shiraz radio, several Mojahedin-e Khalq and Peykar members were arrested for setting fire to a Shiraz Islamic Revolution Guards Corps vehicle, while seven others were sentenced to prison, having been charged with distributing subversive literature, carrying knives or taking part in clashes. Ahvaz radio said five Mojahedin-e Khalq members were arrested in Sarbandar.

REUTER Office Closed--In a statement broadcast by Tehran radio, the National Guidance Ministry announced that it has closed the REUTER office in Tehran. It said REUTER had dispatched biased and untrue reports on Iran more than 10 times in the past month and had not heeded official warnings. The closure follows a strong attack by Tehran radio on BBC World Service coverage of the funeral of 72 Islamic Republican Party leaders and supporters killed in the 28 June bombing.

Iraq

In a statement to INA, an official Foreign Ministry spokesman has denied Israeli allegations that Brazil has supplied Iraq with uranium. The spokesman asserted that Israel is circulating such lies in order to divert public attention from its crimes against Iraq.

Jordan

In an interview with BBC, King Husayn said Jordan's differences with the United States are "basic," stemming from the Palestinian issue and U.S. support for Israel. He asserted that discussion about the so-called Jordanian option is a waste of time, explaining that there is a Palestinian problem existing on Palestinian soil under Israeli occupation that cannot be solved without the Palestinians' participation and contribution to the establishment of peace. He expressed the opinion that Israeli Prime Minister Begin had exploited the Iraqi nuclear reactor incident for electoral advantage and that U.S. credibility in the Arab world was greatly affected by its reaction to the attack.

PDRY

Damascus radio reported that PDRY President 'Ali Nasir Muhammad left Damascus at the end of a 1-day visit to Syria during which he held talks with President Hafiz al-Asad. In a predeparture statement cited by the radio, the PDRY leader said the two sides had agreed to strengthen cooperation and coordination among the countries of the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front and their friendship with the communist bloc. He later returned to Aden, according to Aden radio.

FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 130 *8 July 1981*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW i

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

'Arafat Calls For Arab Defense Council Meeting [VOP] A 1
Qaddumi Interviewed in Paris by Monte Carlo Radio A 1
Fatah's Salah Khalaf Views Mideast Issues A 3
[London AL-MAJALLAH 4-10 Jul]
VOP Reiterates Conditions for Talks With U.S. A 5

ARABIAN PENINSULA

KUWAIT

Minister Urges U.S. Response to Israeli Raid C 1
[London AL-MAJALLAH 4-10 Jul]

EGYPT

Butrus Ghali Begins Latin American Tour 8 Jul D 1
Committee Meets to Evaluate Africa Policy 4 Jul D 1
Commentary on Begin's Threat to Destroy Missiles D 1

IRAQ

Armed Forces General Command Communique 391 E 1
Ibrahim Receives Cable From France's Mauroy E 1

JORDAN

King Husayn Interviewed by BBC on U.S., Israel F 1
Paris Magazine Interviews King on Regional Issues F 2
Officials Mobilize To Fight Cholera Epidemic F 4
Paper Reports Increased Cairo-Baghdad Tension F 5
[AR-RA'Y 7 Jul]
Briefs: Arab Aid Allocation F 5

LEBANON

Al-Jumayyil Denies Phalangist 'Deal' With Israel G 1
Butrus Holds First Meeting With U.S. Ambassador G 1
Butrus Proposes 17 Jul Followup Committee Meeting G 1
Sham'un 'Indirectly' Criticizes U.S. Syrian Policy G 1

SYRIA

'Ali Nasir Holds Talks in Damascus 7 Jul H 1
Khaddam Meets With PDRY Foreign Minister H 1
Damascus Reports Downing of Israeli Plane H 1
Conference Resolution on U.S. Military in Mideast [AL-BA'TH 26 Jun] H 1
Reasons for Followup Committee Failure Posited H 3
Papers Say Missiles Will Remain in Lebanon H 4
AL-BA'TH Assertion H 4
ATH-THAWRAH Affirmation H 4
Philip Habib Expected To Find Stands Unchanged H 5

ISRAEL

Begin, U.S. Official Discuss Sinai Agreement I 1
Begin, Abu-Hatzera Discuss Coalition Terms I 1
Agudat Yisra'el Responds To Coalition Proposal I 1
Peres Interviewed on National Unity Government I 2
Begin, Dayan Disagree on Autonomy Issues [POST 7 Jul] I 3
Sharon Reportedly To Be Defense Minister [HA'ARETZ 8 Jul] I 3
Tamir May Be Named Ambassador to Washington [MA'ARIV 7 Jul] I 4
Drone Crashes 7 Jul Due To 'Technical Problem' I 4
Jerusalem Reports on Soviet-Syrian Exercise I 4

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

'Source' Cited on Support for Sahara Referendum Q 1
FLN Central Committee Approves Political Bureau Q 1

LIBYA

Ash-Shahati Cited on OAU Summit, U.S. Ties Q 2
Paper Attacks U.S. Campaign Against Terrorism [London AL-ZAHF AL-AKHDAR 26 Jun] Q 2

MOROCCO

Text of King Hassan 2 Jul Press Conference Q 4

SUDAN

ROSE AL-YUSUF Interviews Numayri on Egypt, Arabs [29 Jun] Q 17

TUNISIA

PLO's Faruq Qaddumi Arrives in Tunis 7 Jun [VOF] Q 22
Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister's Visit Reported [L'ACTION 1 Jul] Q 22

EAST AFRICA

TANZANIA

Nyerere Speech Views Foreign Exchange Problems R 1

CENTRAL AFRICA

CAMEROON

Ahidjo Affirms Nigerian Border Region Calm S 1

ZAIRE

AZAP Terms Belgian Refugee Policy 'Facade' S 1

WEST AFRICA

GHANA

Measures Taken To End Tribal Dispute in North T 1
DAILY GRAPHIC Comment T 2
State Sugar Factories Close Due to Lack of Funds T 2

IVORY COAST

Planned Strike by Doctors Union Called Off [FRATERNITE MATIN 7 Jul] T 3

NIGERIA

Paper Condemns U.S. Attitude on South Africa T 3
Lagos Comments on Choice of Tripoli as OAU Venue T 3
NNP Announces Plans To End Working Accord With NPN T 4

SOUTHERN AFRICA

SOUTH AFRICA

Johannesburg Reports on SWAPO Ambush, Deaths U 1

ZAMBIA

Kaunda Receives Cuban Foreign Minister 2 Jul U 1

ZIMBABWE

Aid for Liberation Movements To Go Through OAU U 1

'ARAFAT CALLS FOR ARAB DEFENSE COUNCIL MEETING

NC071359 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1245 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] In his two interviews published today in a Swiss and an African newspaper, Brother Commander Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] called for holding an urgent meeting of the Arab Defense Council at the foreign and defense ministers level to confront the plots that the United States and Israel are concocting against the whole Arab nation.

In his interview with the African newspaper LE CONTINENT, Brother Abu 'Ammar said that the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor last month was evidence of a large-scale plot against the Arab area, reaffirming, at the same time, Washington's collusion in planning this aggression which Israeli elements merely executed.

Brother Abu 'Ammar stressed that the repeated Zionist attacks on the Palestinian camps and the acts of terrorism by the Zionist enemy against the Palestinian people were in implementation of the extermination and liquidation war plan that the Zionist commanders declared against the Palestinian people.

On the objectives of the urgent conference of the Arab Defense Council which he called for, Brother Abu 'Ammar said: We will determine the defense measures that must be adopted to confront the U.S.-Israeli plot.

On the forthcoming mission of the U.S. envoy to the area, Brother Abu 'Ammar described this mission as a ridiculous action aimed at anesthetizing the Arab nation, affirming that the fabricated missiles crisis in Lebanon was only a pretext to wage further Israeli attacks against the Palestinian people.

In his interview with 24 HEURES, a newspaper published in Lausanne, Switzerland, Brother Abu 'Ammar commented on the statements made by French President Mitterrand regarding the PLO and its legitimate representation of the Palestinian people as their sole representative. He described these statements as inconsistent with international legitimacy, which acknowledged the PLO's sole representation of the Palestinian people.

QADDUMI INTERVIEWED IN PARIS BY MONTE CARLO RADIO

JN061930 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1700 GMT 6 Jul 81

[Nabil Darwish interview with PLO Political Department chief 'Abu al-Lutf, identified by his nom de guerre "Faruq Qaddumi," in Paris--date not given; recorded]

[Text] [Question] During your current visit to Paris you have had and will have contacts with French [words indistinct]. Can you brief us on this visit and on the contacts that have already taken place?

[Answer] Our visit was made at the invitation conveyed by the French ambassador from Mr Cheysson. Yesterday we met with Mr Cheysson, and we will meet with Mr Jobert, [names indistinct] and Mr Debre. This visit is being made following the change in the French administration. This made it imperative for us to acquaint ourselves with the new French administration's stand on the Palestine issue and the Middle East crisis, particularly after the statements [words indistinct] for the sake of understanding the true stand of the new French Government.

[Question] May we pause for a moment over your meeting with French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson. Have you detected any specific French stand on the Middle East crisis and the Palestinian issue in particular, and what about the Camp David accords?

[Answer] Mr Cheysson was clear to the effect that the French stand will not move backward and will solidify a better stand in the near future. However, there is no doubt that the statements made about the PLO, the national rights of the Palestinian people and the Camp David accords have been interpreted to us in another way. The French side asserted that the Palestinian state is one of the issues which the French Government supports and takes for granted. The Camp David accords will under no circumstances affect any work or stand France will adopt in the future. We discussed bilateral relations and the need to upgrade the diplomatic representation of the PLO office in Paris. The answer was positive. We will have to wait to acquaint ourselves with the French stand in the near future.

[Question] Stands have changed and developed as was clear during the recent Luxembourg summit. In light of the French stand, you must have discussed the European initiative on the Middle East? Has this initiative been suspended or has it retreated?

[Answer] Actually we did not discuss the European initiative because for some time we have come to believe that the EEC countries are revolving around themselves and that there is no collective development of a European stand. Hence, we stressed during our talks with Mr Cheysson the need to understand the stand of every European state. This is what mainly concerns us and what we are endeavoring to achieve in the future. We want to acquaint ourselves with the French stand on the Palestinian issue and the Middle East crisis, because, as I said, we have come to believe that some European countries have become an obstacle to development of the other Western countries' stands. Hence, we will focus only on the individual stand of every country. This is what we discussed with Mr Cheysson.

[Question] Many quarters were waiting for the outcome of the Israeli elections to take a final stand on the Palestinian issue. In the forefront of these quarters were the United States and Europe including France. The outcome of the Israeli elections makes it quite difficult to define such stands. Did you discuss this topic with Mr Cheysson and if so what were your feelings?

[Answer] The situation that emerged in Israel following the recent elections seems to have raised many questions among the European countries. However, as far as we are concerned, this matter is settled. We know that if Peres wins or if Begin remains, the aggressive Israeli policy will not change and the possibilities of war will be intensified in the area because the United States, with its new administration, is giving the green light to Israel to proceed with this policy.

The implementation of such a policy and the scenarios of the Labor Party might, however, differ and receive some support from some European states. Therefore, I say that the Socialist Party in France, in view of its relations with the Labor Party, was hoping for the success of Peres. But reality proved otherwise. Questions raised were thereby on this issue and on the possibility of adopting a more lenient stand--they believe--than some other stands to help them with their relations with the Arab states. In this respect, we pointed out to the French side that Arab-European relations must be essentially based on the joint interests of the two sides. So, where do joint interests with Israel fit? Indeed, the Arabs have become bored with waiting and with such talk about relations with Israel that must be taken into consideration. In reality, they are relations with the United States. These relations are not with Israel. If the European states want clearer relations, particularly after the attack on the Arab nuclear reactor. [sentence as heard] After the attack on the reactor, a large number of questions faced all the Arab states, particularly the friends of the United States. It has become clear that Israel's security and Israel's interests are stronger than the Arabs' interests, security and friendship. The Arabs must adopt a decisive stand on this issue.

[Question] Your itinerary includes many party meetings as you mentioned a short while ago. One of them is with Lionel Jospin, secretary general of the French Socialist Party. [Words indistinct] to establish party relations, if I may say this?

[Answer] I said in the beginning that I came here to get acquainted with France's stand. The PLO has adopted a policy. It [word indistinct] to crystallize a stand for each European state so that things do not get mixed up. We will submit this issue to the Arab League. We will define the stand of each European state on its own as well as the method of dealing with it because we have lost all hope in any possible initiative in the future. Everyone is saying this every day, particularly because there is a Soviet initiative, for example, which offers a higher ceiling than any possible European initiative. We are concerned about the political stand of every state individually in order to develop this political stand and Arab dealings with each state on its own.

[Question] My last question will be on Arab diplomacy in the Arab arena. We know that the PLO has recently been able to contain or freeze some Arab differences, particularly between Morocco and Libya. Abu al-Lutf, during your stay in Baghdad for the Arab foreign ministers emergency meeting, you and the Kuwaiti foreign minister tried to institute a kind of reconciliation or truce between Baghdad and Damascus; is there anything new on this subject?

[Answer] Brother Yasir 'Arafat exerted painful efforts. He made various tours of the Arab countries, in the east and the west. He was able to achieve much success in bringing closer the Arab points of view of various Arab states, between Libya and Morocco, Algeria and Morocco--or more clearly on the Polisario issue--between Saudi Arabia and Libya, and between Syria and Iraq. No doubt this success achieved by Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] in his repeated tours must result in something practical. I reveal no secrets in saying that the practical thing is for the Arabs to meet at an Arab summit conference very soon to clear up these differences once the atmosphere has been prepared, particularly since they are facing more challenges, beligerency and aggression by the Zionist entity and the U.S. aggressive policy.

[Question] But in Baghdad and after the attack against the Iraqi Tammuz reactor, have you sensed a will for rapprochement between Damascus and Baghdad, for example?

[Answer] I personally felt, particularly when fraternal Syria's representatives came to fraternal Iraq to participate in the Arab foreign ministers conference called to discuss the attack against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, that the stand of the Syrian delegation was positive. The Iraqi side responded and welcomed this Syrian stand which will, God willing, develop to the better to clear up their differences and to reach Arab solidarity because Iraqi-Syrian rapprochement is the axis of a comprehensive Arab rapprochment on the plain of the Arab homeland.

[Darwish] Thank you, Abu al-Lutf.

FATAH'S SALAH KHALAF VIEWS MIDEAST ISSUES

PM061338 London AL-MAJALLAH in Arabic 4-10 Jul 81 pp 29, 30

[Interview of Fatah movement Central Committee member Salah Khalaf, alias Abu Iyad, to Huda al-Murr in Beirut--date not given]

[Excerpts] [Question] According to certain statements attributed to you, you have called for a reconciliation between Syria and Iraq. Is the PLO carrying out any mediation to bring about a Syrian-Iraqi rapprochement?

[Answer] We have tried this in the past but all our efforts have failed. Apparently neither side is prepared for a meeting or dialogue But in a time of crisis we always try to urge them to meet, if only for an ordinary meeting. What is being sought is not unity between the two countries but only understanding, so that Syrian-Iraqi relations can be just like any normal relations between two Arab countries, particulary following the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor.

In fact the Israeli strike was tragic and painful to all the Arabs and in view of this tragic situation we had to call on both sides to get together and to come to an understanding. I believe that the time has come to end secondary conflicts in the Arab nation, particularly at this stage when we are all faced with the Zionist danger. I also believe that Syrian-Iraqi understanding would lead to the end of the Iraq-Iran war.

[Question] Apropos of the Iraq-Iran war, the PLO was a member of the good offices committee. What progress have you made in this regard?

[Answer] From the outset we knew that the result of the Iraq-Iran war was going to be in terms of wasted economic or military power. This was evident from the first month of the war, so you can imagine what the situation is now that the war has entered its 10th month and the end is not yet in sight. Regardless of who wins or loses, both sides are losers.

[Question] Despite all your efforts, were you unable to stop this war between two Islamic countries?

[Answer] The problem lies with both sides. The Iraqi side says: "I cannot retreat or withdraw unless a price is paid for this war." And the Iranian side says: "I am not prepared to negotiate as long as Iraq occupies part of my territories." Each side is clinging to its views and refusing to make concessions.

[Question] Do you believe that if an Arab-Israeli war breaks out Iran will fight on the Arab side?

[Answer] If an Arab-Israeli war breaks out maybe people will wake up and use their heads, maybe the Iraq-Iran war will come to an end and maybe the efforts of both countries will be devoted to facing the Israeli enemy. A few months ago I said that war with Israel will not break out. Of course, this is not because the United States loves Syria or Iraq but because it loves its own interests. Any Arab-Israeli war--whether with Syria or with anybody else--would mean the destruction of U.S. policy in the area. Here I wonder: What does the United States want from the area? The answer is for it to ward off the Soviet danger. It also wants to keep Syria isolated and weak so that the pro-Camp David wing will become stronger. Since Begin cannot confine a war to Al-Biqa' in Lebanon because Syria would probably shift it to the Golan, the Syrian-Soviet treaty would be tested, particularly since the Soviets would be obliged to side with Syria, for otherwise their reputation in the area would be undermined. If the Soviets took part, the Americans would be scared and would be compelled to side with Israel, the consequences of which might be a worldwide conflagration. This is something that the U.S. and the Soviet sides have claimed they do not want, particularly since the latter side confirms in most of its statements its support for Syria.

[Question] We Arabs are accustomed to mere statements.

[Answer] There is a difference between the Soviet Union fighting on our behalf and it supporting and helping us. If we look at the past we find that the Soviet Union was surprised--just as we were--by the Egyptian Army's defeat in 1967. But in the 1973 war the Soviet Union met the demands of Syria and Egypt and gave them everything they wanted. We must not forget that the situation now is different. There is a treaty between Syria and the Soviet Union under which the latter is compelled to intervene immediately and rapidly in the event of a Syrian-Israeli war.

[Question] Has the deployment of SAM missiles in Al-Biqa' led to a strategic balance in the area?

[Answer] In the final analysis the missiles help Syria. The presence of missiles in Al-Biqa' protects Syrian territory as well as the Arab Deterrent Forces in Lebanon. They are also a response and challenge to the Israeli aircraft which struck at Syrian aircraft in Al-Biqa'.

[Question] Was there any mention of the [Palestinian] resistance in the negotiations which U.S. presidential envoy Habib carried out in the area?

[Answer] There was no mention of the resistance in all Philip Habib's negotiations, nor did the resistance have a role in them. When the Lebanese side lodged a complaint against Israel because of the continuing attack on the south, Habib said: I hope to be able to stop the strikes but the Palestinians must not give Israel an excuse to launch raids on Lebanese territory." Philip Habib does not know that Israel strikes whether or not it has a reason. All he knows is that the south is the scene of fedayeen operations. He said in Syria: "Every time Israel receives a blow from the resistance it responds by bombing the south and the Palestinian camps in Lebanon. The proof is Begin's statements; he always reiterates that he will continue to strike at the Palestinians wherever they may be and whether or not there is reason."

[Question] Has Habib's return to the area made you at all optimistic?

[Answer] So far as is known, the United States does not want to solve the Middle East crisis at present but wants to discuss it some time after April 1982, after the second stage of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Sinai. Which means that it does not want any setback for the Camp David accords, despite the fact that the Soviets have called for a conference to discuss the Middle East problem as a whole. According to well-placed people, both the American and the Soviet sides desire for this conference; the difference is over the timing. The Soviets want it with maximum speed but the Americans would prefer it to be later, so that it will not affect the Israeli withdrawal, or rather the Camp David accords.

[Question] Are you satisified with the conference for which Brezhnev was called?

[Answer] In principle the Palestine National Council has welcomed it. The invitation to the conference proves two things: First, the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and, second, it confirms the right to establish an independent Palestinian state.

VOP REITERATES CONDITIONS FOR TALKS WITH U.S.

JN071720 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1447 GMT 7 Jul 81

[From the "With the Events" program]

[Excerpts] For the thousandth time a U.S. official spokesman has reaffirmed that his country is not ready to recognize the PLO unless it recognizes Israel and UN Resolutions 242 and 338. For the thousandth time we reaffirm that we are not infatuated with such recognition. Moreover, we are in a state of complete struggle with the United States, which is helping the people's enemies and is the base of international terrorism.

If the United States recognizes the PLO without any preconditions and on the basis of recognition of the Palestinian people's inalienable national rights, then this will be a very important and positive matter. If it does not recognize either the PLO or the Palestinian people's rights, then the matter will be a natural thing to which we have been accustomed.

The PLO had previously defined its stands on the issue of its relations with the United States with clarity and publicly. It would do no harm if we recall this stand, which says that we are ready to negotiate with the U.S. administration publicly and in broad daylight and without any preconditions on the basis of our inalienable national rights, which were acknowledged by the United Nations and recognized by the majority of world countries, making these rights the basis for dealing with our revolution and our cause. We welcome any negotiations on this basis. We see no reason to do so on other bases.

KUWAIT

MINISTER URGES U.S. RESPONSE TO ISRAELI RAID

PM061600 London AL-MAJALLAH in Arabic 4-10 Jul 81 pp 30, 31

[Interview of Kuwaiti Foreign Minister Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad as-Sabah by Raghidah Dirgham in New York--date not given]

[Excerpt] [Question] Do you support the stationing of Arab forces along with the Syrian forces in Lebanon?

[Answer] There is no objection to any Arab forces participating with the Syrian forces. Initially forces from Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Sudan participated, but later withdrew. It is not Syria's fault. I say again here that when the problem ends--and we are heading toward ending it--the Syrian Army will not remain in Lebanon. It will remain within its borders to defend itself against the Arabs' enemy, Israel. Syria's view that Al-Biqa' is essential to its safety and security is temporary; Syria has no designs on a single inch of Lebanon. Al-Biqa' is Lebanese, and Syria placed missiles there only to defend its forces. This is its right.

[Question] Do you believe that the United States had advance knowledge of the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor?

[Answer] I have no information in this regard. I believe that the United States had no information as the raid occurred but knew of it immediately afterward.

[Question] Did you expect a different United States attitude toward Israel after the raid?

[Answer] We wish that the United States had changed its attitude to prove it had no advance knowledge of the raid. I would like to say that I have high hopes the United States will not lose its friends in the area. First, it has to prove it had no knowledge of the action and, second, it should take measures to prove to the Arab world that it is not colluding with Israel in this action.

[Question] What should these measures be?

[Answer] If arms are given to a certain state, one of the first conditions is that such arms should not be used offensively but for self-defense only. Israel's action was not self-defense. The United States has given Israel the latest U.S. weapons and technology, which it used in a blatant attack on a nuclear reactor which is for peaceful purposes, as has been attested by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the French Government. The United States must take steps regarding this clear act of aggression or there will be some kind of Arab reaction.

[Question] Will the reaction be economic or political, and how far is Kuwait prepared to pursue such a reaction?

[Answer] Kuwait is part of the Arab world. I will not say that I will adopt a specific measure without an Arab consensus.

[Question] Is there an Arab consensus on the need to take Arab measures if the United States does not take measures against the Israel raid?

[Answer] Arab meetings will be held in order to study this subject. Certainly the Arab world will study and analyze what has happened, because what happened is no small matter. Agreement will be reached on what the Arab countries should do. I have no right to say what measures should be taken. The matter should be studied by the Arab countries.

[Question] If the United States does not take measures the Arab world considers appropriate, will the Arab countries remain silent?

[Answer] I am responsible only in my country; I do not speak for the Arab countries. I hope that some measure will be taken so the United States will feel the displeasure of the Arab world. This might crystallize after analysis and study at future Arab meetings.

BUTRUS GHALI BEGINS LATIN AMERICAN TOUR 8 JUL

NC080856 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0720 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Text] Cairo, 8 Jul (MENA)--Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali and the delegation accompanying him left Cairo this morning for Uruguay on the first leg of his tour of several Latin American countries.

Before leaving, Dr Butrus Ghali said that he has been asked by President Anwar as-Sadat to visit seven Latin American countries--Uruguay, Argentina, Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Honduras and Guatemala--to deliver written messages from the president to the presidents of these states. He said that during his tour he will meet with foreign ministers and senior officials to discuss the activation of diplomatic, economic and political relations between Cairo and the capitals of these states.

He will outline the dimensions of the Egyptian diplomatic activity on the Palestine question and for achieving the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. He will also discuss with these officials the participation of their countries in the multinational force that will be deployed along the border between Egypt and Israel.

COMMITTEE MEETS TO EVALUATE AFRICA POLICY 4 JUL

NC042030 Cairo MENA in English 1935 GMT 4 Jul 81

[Text] Cairo, 4 Jul (MENA)--The special committee on Africa held its first meeting this evening under Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali to assess the outcome of 37th session of the African Ministerial Council and the recent Nairobi African summit conference.

Dr Ghali told MENA that the committee is to discuss a number of issues, at the head of which are the African states' stand towards the Middle East problem and the Palestinian issue, the situation in Chad and the necessity of a Libyan withdrawal from Chad.

The minister of state further said that committee will also start a general assessment of the present government in Chad and its ability to achieve a national reconciliation, in addition to the Moroccan Sahara issue, the Ethiopian-Somali conflict and the new diplomacy to help Namibia.

Dr Ghali went on to say that in the light of the committee's discussion of those issues, Egypt will draw up a new policy on Africa.

He added that he will meet with the African ambassadors in Cairo on Monday to discuss with them the outcome of the recent African summit conference.

The African Society in Cairo will hold a seminar on Tuesday to evaluate the results of the African summit conference. It will be attended by a number of African foreign ministers and ambassadors.

COMMENTARY ON BEGIN'S THREAT TO DESTROY MISSILES

NC071450 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 7 Jul 81

['Abd al-'Azim Hammad commentary: "The Syrian Missile Crisis in Lebanon Is Again on the Surface of Events"]

[Text] The issue of the Syrian missiles in Lebanon has again come to the fore in events in the Middle East. News of the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor has disappeared and in time the Arab and international reactions to the raid have eased.

Furthermore, the fierce Israeli election campaign, which elicited concentrated attention inside and outside Israel, has become a matter of the past. What remains of this campaign today are the maneuvers and countermaneuvers regarding the formation of the next Israeli Cabinet. Of course, Prime Minister Menahem Begin is playing the role of the first hero in these maneuvers.

Philip Habib, the U.S. envoy for the settlement of the Syrian missile crisis in Lebanon, is returning to the area today. When he returns, he will find that two different developments await him. On the one hand, the efforts of the Arab followup committee succeeded in achieving an acceptable settlement of the Zahlah crisis, which led to all these complications. It was agreed that the Phalangist forces withdraw from the city and that Lebanese internal security forces replace them. Thus, no justification for the Syrian military siege of Zahlah exists any longer. Lifting this siege has actually begun.

It is known that it was the Syrian forces' confrontation of the Phalangists in Zahlah which led to the Israeli Air Force's intervention in the battles. Israel justified its intervention by saying that it is committed to defending the Christians in Lebanon. This is what led the Syrians to deploy their missiles in the Al-Biqa' valley. There is no doubt that this development--the settlement of the Zahlah problem--is a positive development, which the Arab followup committee is now trying to utilize as a prelude to a settlement of all aspects of the Lebanese problem.

The second development awaiting the U.S. envoy upon his return to the area today is Israeli Prime Minister Begin's statements. The crisis has begun to move toward relaxation through the joint efforts of several sides, and Begin has chosen this time to say--according to a story by BSN [as heard], a U.S. television network--that Israel will destroy the Syrian missiles if they are not withdrawn within 2 weeks. Begin added that he will specifically inform Habib of this.

There is no doubt that by any standard Menahem Begin's statement constitutes a negative stand. It is a return to the language of ultimatums, which prompts the other side to adopt a hard line so that it cannot be said that it submitted to threats. It is also an unjustified escalation of the tension of the missile problems at a time when matters have begun to move toward relaxation. This is in addition to the fact that Israel is not entitled to assume such a right to intervene in Lebanese internal affairs.

Perhaps some may think--and we are among them--that Mr Begin considers raising this kind of crisis a golden opportunity to achieve victory in his political battles in Israel. However, we shall continue to wonder how long an election campaign or a local political maneuver in Israel can be a dividing line between war and peace in the Middle East.

ARMED FORCES GENERAL COMMAND COMMUNIQUE 391

JN071655 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1612 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The Iraqi Armed Forces continue to inflict various kinds of losses on the Iranian enemy. During the past 24 hours, our armed forces killed 60 Iranians, downed 1 helicopter and destroyed other war equipment. Communique No 391 issued tonight by the Iraqi Armed Forces General Command said that known enemy losses in equipment were the destruction of one tank, six vehicles, two guns and five ammunition stockpiles. The text of Communique No 391 issued by the Armed Forces General Command is as follows:

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. The activities of our able armed forces in the various operational sectors have continued. The results for last night and today are as follows:

I. Known enemy losses:

A. Our advanced units pounded with various weapons an enemy troop concentration in the Nowsud region, killing 28 soldiers. In the same area, our armed forces downed one enemy helicopter.
B. Three killed and one radar vehicle destroyed in the Sar-e Zahab region.
C. One ammunition stockpile destroyed in Gilan-e Gharb region.
D. Three killed and one gun destroyed in the Mimak region in front of our positions in Sayf Sa'd.
E. One of our advanced units ambushed an enemy patrol in the Dezful region and forced it to retreat, leaving behind 14 dead. In the same area, our forces destroyed one gun, one vehicle and one ammunition stockpile.
F. Seven killed and one vehicle and one ammunition stockpile destroyed in the Shush region.
G. One tank, two vehicles and one ammunition stockpile destroyed in the Khafajiyah [Susangerd] region.
H. Five killed and one vehicle and one ammunition stockpile destroyed in the Abadan region.

Thus, total known enemy losses are 60 killed and 1 tank, 6 vehicles, 2 guns, 5 ammunition stockpiles and 1 helicopter destroyed.

II. Our losses:

A. In personnel: Eight martyrs in all sectors.
B. In equipment: One personnel carrier and one vehicle damaged.

[Signed] The Armed Forces General Command, 7 July 1981

IBRAHIM RECEIVES CABLE FROM FRANCE'S MAUROY

JN061336 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1310 GMT 6 Jul 81

[Text] Baghdad, 6 Jul (INA)--French Premier Pierre Mauroy has reiterated his country's desire to develop cooperation between Iraq and France in the service of their peoples' legitimate interests.

In a cable in reply to the congratulatory cable sent by Revolution Command Council Vice Chairman 'Izzat Ibrahim on the occasion of his election to the French premiership, Mauroy said that the existing dialogue between Iraq and France constitutes a significant contribution to international stability and to further developing detente among nations. He described the Iraqi-French cooperation as one between two countries which enjoy the equal desire for independence based on understanding, mutual respect and justice. The French official called for boosting bilateral cooperation and for developing it in accordance with the principles of freedom, peace and solidarity.

KING HUSAYN INTERVIEWED BY BBC ON U.S., ISRAEL

JN071338 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Amman--His Majesty King Husayn said that the United States has no fixed policy on the Middle East region. It only reacts in one way--to support and back Israel whether Israel is right or wrong.

In an interview with the BBC program "America, Europe and the World," his majesty added: Our differences with the United States are basic, stemming from the tragedy of Palestine and the Palestinian people, which has not yet been solved, and from the total U.S. support of Israel.

His majesty pointed to the Camp David process and described it as a dead horse. He expressed the conviction that there is no hope of any progress toward the establishment of just and lasting peace if the Camp David road is chosen as the only means or method. The Egyptian-Israeli side of the problem is the least complicated one because Israel is still occupying the whole of Palestine in addition to other Arab states' territories. At the same time, Israel attacks not only the frontline states, but also those behind the line.

His majesty went on to say that unfortunately, the United States has given a great deal of material, moral and military support to Israel without getting an Israeli promise in return to withdraw from the occupied lands or even to respect the principles contained in UN Security Council Resolution No 242. The situation in the occupied lands has never been worse. The world has talked a great deal about human rights but nothing has moved the feelings of the world to adopt an action on the status quo in the occupied lands.

Israel disavows the Palestinians their human rights. It continuously changes the status of the Palestinian land. This puts real obstacles in the path of achieving peace.

His Majesty King Husayn said: We have welcomed all moves to raise the issue before the international community. We welcomed the initiative of our friends in Europe as well as the recent Soviet proposal. The issue is first and foremost the issue of Palestine and should be dealt with by all those who are concerned with it in the region, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

His majesty pointed out that the stands of the European states and most countries in the world are similar in principle to the Soviet Union's stand on the foundations for peace in the Middle East based on total withdrawal from all the territories occupied in June 1967, including Arab Jerusalem, the Palestinians' right to free self-determination and their right to an independent state on their Palestinian soil with guarantees for the safety and security of all when peace is established.

His majesty focused on the issue of Jerusalem, saying: Jerusalem is an issue bigger and greater than being Israel's political capital in view of its extreme and equal importance to hundreds of millions of Muslims and Christians. When one speaks of Jerusalem, one speaks of the restoration of Arab Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty within the framework of a just and honorable peace so that the city will become a symbol and essence of peace after its restoration.

His Majesty added: Talking about the so-called Jordanian option is a waste of time because the fact is that there is a Palestinian problem existing on Palestinian soil under Israeli occupation. The Palestinian problem cannot be solved without the Palestinian people's participation and contribution to the establishment of peace.

Referring to the Israeli elections, his majesty said: Begin was not sure of winning the elections prior to the aggression against the nuclear reactor in Beghdad. He benefited from, rather, he exploited the incident, proving beyond any doubt that there is a sizable majority in Israel that wants their leaders to be aggressive and dependent on might more than on following the course of peace in the interest of everybody in the region, the world at large and coming generations.

On the U.S. reaction to the Israeli aggression against the nuclear reactor in Baghdad, his majesty said: The U.S. credibility in the Arab world was greatly affected at a time when the belief was that some change had taken place in U.S. policy in light of the facts that emerged, in the light of the continued aggression and, most of all, in the light of U.S. interests in the region. However, there is no indication of that.

PARIS MAGAZINE INTERVIEWS KING ON REGIONAL ISSUES

JN261258 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 26 Jun 81

[Text] Paris--His Majesty King Husayn has stated that there is a large portion of people in Israel who are following Begin's arrogant and fanatic line, which is hostile to the Arab nation, disavows its rights and is aimed against the Arab nation's dignity, land and people.

In an interview published by the Paris-based magazine AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI today, his majesty said that if Begin wins the forthcoming elections, this would show that the overwhelming majority of Israelis belong to Begin's line and arrogance and that Begin represents them with all his practices in Palestine and all over the occupied land and his practices against our Arab world and Arab man. Lately, we experienced the Israeli aggression against fraternal Iraq and the attack on the nuclear reactor, which is considered a cultural center to be used by the Arab man to join the march of progress in this world, to forge ahead, to catch up with his age, to advance and to elevate his standard in every facet of life.

His majesty asserted: If the battle is imposed on us, our only option will be to sacrifice in defense of this land and this nation's honor. His majesty asked: Is Arab action up to the level of challenge and is it on the required level of keenness to defend Arab dignity and honor? His majesty said: We do not speak the language of those who want emotional and passionate reaction. But why are we impotent to build and develop our intrinsic power?

His majesty pointed out that the Arab nation does not live for the present alone but is a nation which is proud of its past and is building for its future generations. It is a nation keen on preserving its identity and character and on defending the accomplishments of it generations. It is a nation keen on handing over its responsibilities to generations that will come as free Arabs on the Arab land. It is a nation keen on preserving its dignity and rights and working to regain them everywhere and by all means. There is no justification for the Arabs to be weak. The solution lies in their hands on the land of their Arab homeland.

His Majesty King Husayn added that, at this stage of our life, we see the world's attention focusing on this part of the world. He stated that it is an indisputable fact that the region--no matter whether its geographical area or international communications are concerned--has its effect on the course of events in the entire world. This region also has wealth and resources gushing out from the earth's depths.

At best, we have an opportunity--perhaps 30 years, more or less--to exploit these resources through building and focusing on the basic factor: the Arab individual, thus making this individual qualified and more capable of confronting challenges, developing the edifice of strength and searching for wealth all over the Arab homeland so that he will have an influential role in this world.

King Husayn affirmed that our issue is a just and strong one, which derives its strength from us and the method we are using to defend it, our rights and dignity. In doing this, we are proceeding from the premises of our sense of duty toward coming generations and our commitment to the past. One the other hand, naturally, there is Israel and its intentions and ambitions.

His majesty said that Iraq is preoccupied with defending its nation, its rights and dignity. Iraq is fighting to safeguard this nation's future, security, stability and dignity in a battle which we hope will stop and that we wish had never begun. However, this battle was imposed on Iraq, the Arab nation and individual.

We have always supported stopping the fighting and entering negotiations, which will remove all the causes of this fighting and this situation. The Arab right which Iraq is defending is known and we support it with all our potential and capabilities because it is a legitimate right.

His Majesty King Husayn called for measuring up to the level of our responsibility so that the Arab potential and capabilities are used in a constructive process that would safeguard the Arab nation and ward off threats from it. He also called for real coordination, a coordination based on trust and working for the future and not only the present, particularly since the Arab nation is being subjected to threats and ambitions--which are directed against the Arab personality, our ancestor's achievements and the future of our coming generations.

Are we going to measure up to the required level? Will there be a confident reawakening of the Arab individual, in his awareness and great aspirations to make the present the beginning of a good future, if God wills?

His Majesty King Husayn added: Iraq has tried and is still trying to build its intrinsic strength. This is why it is a target of the Zionist onslaught. We stand on the longest frontline and God knows how much we are suffering in order to build our strength as much as we can with the backing of our brothers.

Yet if we consider this in terms of figures and truths, will this be proportionate to or can it be compared even to a small extent with what world Zionism and the elements supporting Israel are giving year after year?

King Husayn said: I urge the Arabs to tell this world, which greatly depends on this oil, we only want right to prevail.

His Majesty wondered whether or not we have any significance. Israel and Zionism take and we give. Is this fair treatment? This is the question which the Arab individual must answer, and so must the entire international community.

His Majesty added that war may be imposed by Israel. This is a real possibility following the attack on the nuclear reactor in Baghdad. Is there any doubt that Israel, with its contempt for all international conventions, its arrogance and the arms it possesses, is capable of striking at any spot it chooses? The question, then, is directed to the brothers in this Arab world. When will we move with determination, firmness and manhood to build up our strength and confront this challenge?

In answer to a question on convening an Arab summit conference to deal with this situation, his majesty said: We are advocators of a long-awaited serious action.

His Majesty King Husayn described his visit to the Soviet Union as highly successful and said that it took place under the delicate circumstances prevailing in this region and the world. Discussions were held in an atmosphere of absolute clarity and frankness.

He said: We discussed our beliefs on all subjects pertaining to bilateral relations and issues in this part of the world. We reiterated our appreciation for the principled stands of those who support the Arab cause with regard to the bases according to which peace should be established. These bases include complete Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab lands including Jerusalem, recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people on Palestinian soil and the setting up of an independent state on their national soil.

His majesty said: Concerning the trip I am scheduled to make to the United States toward the end of the year in response to an official invitation, if it takes place, I will be, as always, clear and frank. The question I ask here, there and everywhere--since it is time that the picture became finally clear--is: Is there a possibility for a basic change in the U.S. stands toward Israel and the issues of the region? Do they have any respect for this Arab nation and are they determined to take a course which will further their national interests, or will they continue to bow to Zionist forces here and there? These questons are in the conscience of every Arab individual.

On Jordanian-Syrian relations, his majesty said: We were always, and continue to be, enthusiastic about everything that is for the good of this Arab nation, even during the painful, sad stages through which we have passed, because of the hopes in our hearts and consciences. However, we were confronted by bitter reality. This will not affect all that we have attempted and continue to attempt to build to serve both peoples in both countries, hence to serve our Arab nation to confront the Israeli threats and the dangerous situations confronting this nation.

His majesty affirmed that we in Jordan support our brothers. He referred to the recent meeting convened in Tunis, which confirmed that the stand of the Arab nation is one in confronting these challenges and dangers.

His Majesty King Husayn said: We in Jordan stand on the longest confrontation line. We will do the impossible to fulfill our trust and prove the truth of our adherence to this land by preventing Israel or anyone else from being in a position enabling them to deal blows to any part of the Arab world as long as we are alive and unified.

His majesty said that relations with fraternal Syria are normal at this time in particular and are not as they used to be, nor are they as bad as they were at one stage. As a matter of fact, Jordan's stands have not changed at all. We wish all the Arab brothers well. Our policy has not changed or altered. We reject intervention in our internal affairs, and we do not allow ourselves to interfere in the affairs of others.

On the situation in Lebanon, his majesty affirmed that we still support any action which will protect the unity and independence of Lebanon and will bring it to safety through Lebanese-Lebanese dialogue, Lebanese-Palestinian dialogue and Arab action to offer everything possible to achieve this goal in the interest of Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, every Arab country and the entire Arab homeland.

OFFICIALS MOBILIZE TO FIGHT CHOLERA EPIDEMIC

JN061659 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 6 Jul 81

[Excerpt] Prime Minister Mudar Badran today presided over an extraordinary meeting of the Higher Permanent Committee for Public Safety attended by all its members, governors and directors of police departments in the kingdom.

The prime minister announced that some 16 cholera cases have been located in various parts of Amman proper and the suburbs. He added that three persons have died of the disease.

The prime minister requested the governors to use the authority vested in them by the martial law administration and take all necessary measures to contain and root out this epidemic. He asked for the formation of emergency committees and for the creation of an emergency operation room at the Directorate of Public Security comprising representatives of the concerned ministries and departments. He also asked all executive authorities to cooperate with the Ministry of Health and the Armed Forces Medical Services in order to assist all victims and safeguard the lives of citizens.

PAPER REPORTS INCREASED CAIRO-BAGHDAD TENSION

JN070835 Amman AR-RA'Y in Arabic 7 Jul 81 p 1

[Exclusive report]

[Text] Cairo--Tension has increased in the relations between Cairo and Baghdad. The Egyptian Government has decided to deport five Iraqi diplomats, including Walid 'Abd ar-Rahman Jawad, head of the office looking after Iraqi interests at the Yugoslav Embassy. The Egyptian Foreign Ministry gave them 1 week to conclude their affairs and leave Cairo.

The Iraqi Government retaliated by deporting a similar number of Egyptians of the same status as the Iraqi employees working at the office taking care of Egyptian interests at the Indian Embassy, including the head of the mission.

Diplomatic relations between Egypt and Iraq have been severed since As-Sadat visited occupied Palestine in 1977.

The reasons behind the Egyptian action have not yet been ascertained. The Iraqi diplomats are expected to return to Baghdad and the Egyptians to Cairo within 2 days.

BRIEFS

ARAB AID ALLOCATIONS--AR-RA'Y has learned that the Jordanian Government has received 16,102,500 dinars, approximately $47.5 million, as the second installment of Arab financial aid from the UAE. It has also received 39,821,432 dinars as the second installment of Arab financial aid from Saudi Arabia. It is noteworthy that the Arab funds received by the Jordanian Government are in accordance with the 10th Arab Summit Conference held in Baghdad in 1978. [Text] [Amman AR-RA'Y in Arabic 5 Jul 81 p 1 JN]

AL-JUMAYYIL DENIES PHALANGIST 'DEAL' WITH ISRAEL

NC071906 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1515 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] After meeting with President Sarkis, Shaykh Pierre al-Jumayyil affirmed the willingness to give all guarantees to the effect that there are no relations with Israel to terminate the uproar that was exploited in waging the war against the eastern parts--a war which was alleged to be against Israel.

The Phalangist leader added that if some people believe that buying arms for self-defense represents a deal [with Israel], we frankly say that our first arms purchases in 1975 were from the Palestinians. At any rate we can draw the line on [certain] matters. However, denying arms to us should be reciprocated by denying arms to others as well. Shaykh Pierre added: Arms must be given to the legal Lebanese authorities and not to the scattered organizations. These organizations are directing their weapons against Lebanon and not against Israel as they allege.

Shaykh Pierre went on to say: There are many things that need to be discussed in a sincere and honest manner to elicit results benefiting Lebanon and the Arab countries--particularly the issue of southern Lebanon which we cannot tackle without dealing with the Palestinian problem. At any rate, we are willing to ensure the success of any honest solution that would guarantee our sovereignty, liberty and dignity.

BUTRUS HOLDS FIRST MEETING WITH U.S. AMBASSADOR

NC080808 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0530 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Text] Foreign Minister Fu'ad Butrus has reviewed with U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon Robert Dillon the situation in respect to the current problems in Lebanon in particular and for the area in general, has reviewed the U.S. role in the Middle East and the policy of the new U.S. administration. This meeting was the first between the new U.S. ambassador and the foreign minister. The meeting was held before Minister Butrus goes abroad on a private visit.

BUTRUS PROPOSES 17 JUL FOLLOWUP COMMITTEE MEETING

NC080639 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 0615 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Excerpt] The Voice of Lebanon has learned that during his meeting last night with the Saudi and Kuwaiti ambassadors, respectively, 'Ali ash-Sha'ir and Al-Bu'ayjan, foreign minister Fu'ad Butrus proposed that the meeting of the Arab followup committee be advanced from 25 to 17 July and that it be held at the presidential palace in B'abda.

SHAM'UN 'INDIRECTLY' CRITICIZES U.S. SYRIAN POLICY

NC071747 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1215 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Today former President Camille Sham'un indirectly criticized U.S. policy when he commented on the incident during which a German plane was fired upon in the course of the joint Syrian-Soviet maneuvers. Mr Sham'un said: I would like to ask the Americans' opinion about this incident. What do they think about the Syrians when--in the past--they were about to sacrifice Lebanon and its vital interests in the hope that Syria would return to the fold of the conservative countries?

'ALI NASIR HOLDS TALKS IN DAMASCUS 7 JUL

JN070630 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Excerpts] President Hafiz al-Asad and 'Ali Nasir Muhammad, chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium, will resume their meeting at noon today. Last night they held a meeting in President Hafiz al-Asad's residence and the president hosted an Iftar dinner in honor of Chairman 'Ali Nasir Muhammad.

Following the Iftar dinner, Presidents Hafiz al-Asad and 'Ali Nasir Muhammad resumed their meeting, during which they reviewed the situation in the Arab region and ways to strengthen Arab resistance against the vicious Zionist-imperialist onslaught directed against the Arab nation.

Some affairs of the pan-Arab Steadfastness and Confrontation Front and ways to strengthen the front were discussed.

KHADDAM MEETS WITH PDRY FOREIGN MINISTER

JN071124 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs, met with PDRY Foreign Minister Salim Salih Muhammad in Damascus this morning. They discussed current Arab affairs and the means to develop the relations between the two fraternal countries.

DAMASCUS REPORTS DOWNING OF ISRAELI PLANE

JN071520 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1515 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] A military spokesman has stated the following:

A 1100 today, 7 July 1981, an enemy pilotless aircraft overflew the positions of our forces which are operating within the Arab Deterrent Forces in Lebanon. Our forces confronted it and downed it.

CONFERENCE RESOLUTION ON U.S. MILITARY IN MIDEAST

PM071554 Damascus AL-BA'TH in Arabic 26 Jun 81 p 3

["Text" of resolution entitled "Checking the Growth of American Military Power" issued by the conference for solidarity with Syria and the PLO held in Damascus 22-25 June]

[Text] I. The international conference for solidarity with Syria and the PLO expresses its profound anxiety regarding the growing military power the United States is accumulating in the Middle East and the Arab Gulf.

The current American administration's policy calling for military intervention in the affairs of the states in the area and other parts of the world to defend so-called U.S. vital interests is a flagrant defiance of the UN Charter and international law.

The conference strongly denounces the establishment of new military bases and the giving of military facilities to the United States, particularly by Egypt, Somalia, Oman and Kenya; the expansion of the existing bases in Cyprus, Turkey, Bahrain and the island of Diego Garcia; the setting up of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force; and the unprecedented American military support for Israel and other collusive forces in the area. The conference also condemns the American administration's current suspect designs of establishing large-scale military concentrations in the whole area on the basis of the Camp David alliance.

The conference is perturbed because the nuclear weapons carried by the American fleets, Israel's nuclear bombs and the American medium-range nuclear missiles that are to be deployed in West Europe constitute a serious threat to the Arab people's entity and existence.

The conference points out that the consolidation of the American military expansion in the areas of the Middle East, the Arab Gulf and the Red Sea is closely linked with the imperialist military designs and bases in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea, Africa and Europe--all of which constitute a serious threat to world peace and undermine international detente--and is closely linked with the military cooperation between the Zionist regime in Israel and the apartheid regime in South Africa, particularly in the field of producing nuclear weapons.

II. The conference for solidarity with Syria and the PLO emphasizes that the escalation of the military buildup in the Middle East area poses a serious threat to the national independence of the area's states.

The basic right to national independence and sovereignty of Egypt, Somalia, Oman and Bahrain, as well as of the other states where there are American military bases, is trampled underfoot and the peoples of these states are subjected to U.S. political and economic designs.

Countries opposed to the imperialist policy, such as Syria, the Libyan Jamahiriyah and the PDRY, are exposed to the dangers of direct military aggression and to acts that threaten their stability.

The liberation struggle of the people of Palestine, the Lebanese National Movement and all the Lebanese national forces, as well as of Arab progressive forces, is now being subjected to constant repressive and aggressive acts by the Israeli forces and other agent forces.

The nonalignment policy, which advocates nonparticipation by developing states in foreign camps and alliances, has been undermined.

The basic aim of all these American military designs is to perpetuate the Arab countries' subservient relations in order to further the exploitative practices of the foreign monopolies, particularly the multinational oil companies; to impede the efforts that are being made to set up vital democratic economic structures that would contribute to economic and social development in the Arab countries; and to prevent the creation of a new international economic system.

The conference also emphasizes that the growing American military buildup in the areas of the Middle East and the Arab Gulf has created new crises which will lead to further explosions disrupting the flow of oil to many peoples in Europe and other continents. The only guarantee of the natural flow of oil is the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East and the Arab Gulf.

The implementation of the Soviet and PDRY proposals regarding the question of peace and security in the areas of the Arab Gulf and the Indian Ocean as well as the Soviet proposals on peace in the Mediterranean will contribute to the attainment of this goal.

Therefore the conference resolves to support the Arab people's just struggle and their liberation movement in every possible way so that:

1. The foreign military bases in the Middle East and the Arab Gulf are removed;
2. The Camp David alliance is liquidated and the formation of any proimperialist military concentrations is prevented;
3. The presence of U.S. and allied Rapid Deployment Forces on Arab territories and territorial waters is resisted;
4. Nuclear weapons and weapons of total destruction are withdrawn from the area, the area is turned into a nuclear-free zone and UN inspections are imposed on Israel's nuclear installations;
5. The policy of nonalignment pursued by the states of this area is respected and any interference in their internal affairs is prevented;

6. The right of the area's people to control their national resources is fully respected;
7. Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy is checked; the Arab territories that have been occupied since 1967 are completely liberated and the realization of the Palestinian Arab people's national rights to return to their homeland, determine their own fate and establish their own independent state on their land is completely ensured.

REASONS FOR FOLLOWUP COMMITTEE FAILURE POSITED

JN071501 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] No matter how many attempts the Lebanese isolationist forces may make to keep from issuing a special announcement stopping their dealings with the Israeli enemy, Syria will not stop proposing the issue of Lebanese accord through the premise of ending the Israeli enemy's presence in Lebanon and cutting off its hand, which is playing with the fraternal state's security and the unity of its people and territory.

Syria will not be stopped by bombast nor the weak pretexts being peddled by the leaders of the isolationist forces in order to keep from making such an announcement. Like every sound pan-Arab logic, Syria's logic is such that it believes that arranging the Lebanese house and establishing security and accord in it cannot be achieved while keeping this house's doors and windows open to the enemy.

If the isolationist forces' leaders view an announcement stopping their dealings with the enemy as offending, why do they not view as offending all that is actually offending? Why did they not view the extending of their hands to what they described as the devil as offending? Why did they not view their disregard of statements by Yitzhaq Rabin and Menahem Begin on Zionist aid to them as offending? Why did they not view all their fascist practices, be these shelling the populated quarters, killing the innocent, destroying houses or expelling the Lebanese citizens, as offending? Furthermore, why did they not consider their attempt to relinquish Lebanon's history, obliterate its Arab face and destroy its cultural heritage as dishonorable and offending?

The pretext being peddled by those isolationists to justify their refraining from issuing a special announcement stopping dealings with the enemy conceals very grave matters which threaten Lebanon's future, Syria's security and the entire Arab nation's fate. In their attempt to justify themselves with such a pretext, the isolationists not only want to abort the Arab followup committee's mission through making it become desperate and view discussions with them as futile, but they also want to exploit the time factor in order to strengthen themselves with the Israeli backing they have been promised, seize the suitable opportunities to disrupt the security situation in Lebanon and resume their implementation of the partition schemes drawn up by the Camp David partners.

Syria is well aware that the isolationist forces are not going to abstain from implementing their traditional schemes. It is also aware of the reasons for the inability of the last Bayt ad-Din meeting to reach the desired results, reasons which center on these forces' intransigence and their evasion of implementing all that Lebanon's national interest and the pan-Arab will dictate. Thus, while aspiring for the success which the followup committee must achieve in its coming meeting, Syria warns the isolationist forces of the consequences of their continued evasion and their efforts not to make an announcement stopping dealings with the enemy.

If the isolationist forces come to their senses, so be it. Otherwise, Syria will not hesitate to shoulder all the necessary pan-Arab responsibilities.

PAPERS SAY MISSILES WILL REMAIN IN LEBANON

AL-BA'TH Assertion

JN070933 Damascus SANA in Arabic 0830 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Damascus, 7 Jul (SANA)--Referring to the resumption of Menahem Begin's threats to launch an aggression against Syria to strike at the Syrian missiles in Al-Biqa', AL-BA'TH says today: We would like to reassure Menahem Begin that despite all his hostile statements, the Syrian missiles will stay on Lebanese soil as long as Israel stays, and that we will not spare any effort to reinforce these missiles with various types of sophisticated arms that will enable the Arab nation to stand fast against Israel. AL-BA'TH adds: If Begin's recent threats to strike at and remove the missile bases in Lebanon mean anything, they mean that Israel, in coordination with the United States, is ready to launch the expected aggression and that all the conditions for this aggression are ready to be implemented. This is something we realized in advance and have fully prepared for.

The Arab nation should measure up to the magnitude of the seriousness of this aggression and its dimensions. It should be extremely vigilant to rout this aggression by preparing for it and mobilizing all its potentials to prevent Israel from realizing its designs. AL-BA'TH asserts that Syria is determined to stand fast and wage thousands of battles against the Zionists so that the Arab nation will safeguard its dignity and its rights to its soil and homeland. Syria is confident of ultimate victory.

ATH-THAWRAH Affirmation

JN080730 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 8 Jul 81

[From the press review]

[Text] In a commentary entitled "The Dimensions and Connotations of Our Strategic Confrontation Decision," the newspaper ATH-THAWRAH says: The confrontation with the belligerent and aggressive Zionists over Lebanon is an unrelenting decision. It is a strategic, not a tactical decision, expressing a firm principled stand. This decision is based on a clear, firm policy and a strong, courageous will. Developments in the Lebanese arena indicate that this Syrian stand is the hallmark of the required pan-Arab stand in this serious phase through which the Arab struggle is passing.

Syria's confrontation with the belligerent Zionists and its downing of enemy reconnaissance planes indicates that the Arab Deterrent Forces' [ADF] missiles have a task that will not be abandoned in spite of the poison and illusions spread by the enemy to cover up its defeat by means of U.S. envoy Philip Habib's mission and after it.

The downing of the eighth reconnaissance aircraft yesterday over Al-Biqa' confirms to all that the missiles will remain in Al-Biqa' as long as the reason for their presence exists. Syria will not allow Zionist belligerence to continue in Lebanese airspace and territory. The battles fought by the Syrian eagles and soldiers in Lebanon in defense of the Lebanese and Palestinian masses give conclusive proof that confrontation with Israel. The prevention of its attacks and confrontation with its conspiratorial designs is a mission which Syria will not be lax in carrying out and which it will not endanger through compromises and negotiations.

This Syrian stand has become an Arab stand which is reflected in the statement issued by the Arab followup committee. The statement calls for ending dealings with Israel, closing the Lebanese door in the face of the Zionists and eliminating all forms of the Israeli presence in Lebanon--whether this presence is in the form of Israeli contacts with agents or Zionist spies present on certain Lebanese sides--as a necessary first step for achieving detente and giving Lebanon the opportunity to overcome its crisis.

PHILIP HABIB EXPECTED TO FIND STANDS UNCHANGED

JN070847 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0430 GMT 7 Jul 81

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "The Road to Peace," TISHRIN comments on the U.S. administration's decision to send U.S. envoy Philip Habib to the Middle East for the third time. The paper also comments on reports published in the U.S. press asserting that Habib will widen his mission geographically and on the objectives of the U.S. sources' assertions that Habib's mission was a great success, described by U.S. President Reagan as almost a miracle.

Habib's mission began when Begin's Israeli Government escalated its threats to launch an attack on Syria and its forces in Lebanon, thus placing the region on the threshold of a major military conflagration. Although it was clear that this conflagration would not have remained a limited one, Begin did not refrain from trying to ignite it. It was also clear that Israel's threats against Syria enjoyed U.S. support. The world press reported that the United States gave Tel Aviv the green light to provoke the Syrian forces, which foiled the plot and the conspiracy to link the strip of traitor Sa'd Haddad with the ghetto of Bashir al-Jumayyil through Zahlah.

When Syria agreed to receive the U.S. envoy, it clearly announced that it rejected threats and would repulse all aggressors strongly and courageously. It would retaliate without hesitation, would not cede any of the Arab rights and categorically rejected the aggressive Israeli logic which called for considering Lebanon an extension of the Israeli security's requisites, deciding what was permissible and impermissible and who could be present there and who could not.

Syria's stand did not change during Habib's first and second trips and it will not change in the future. If anybody has changed his stand, he is not to be found in Syria. If Habib has scored any success that postponed a military conflict, this success, if any, was achieved where the United States has influence and a say. As President Hafiz al-Asad has said, Syria rejected the Israeli conditions which Habib brought with him to Damascus, for his mission in Damascus was basically to bring Israel's conditions to Syria.

The U.S. Government errs once again if it thinks that Begin's threats against Syria, Israel's aggressive acts against the Arab nation and the weak Arab reaction to these acts have softened the Arab stands, preoccupying them with matters beyond the context of the crisis fabricated by Begin and related to a settlement in the region. Washington's adoption of Israel, its commitment to ensure Israel's military supremacy over the Arabs under the pretext of protecting it, its clinging to the designs of the Camp David accords and its hope to bring the Arabs and Israel together in an alliance against the Soviet Union do not constitute an acceptable basis for the Arabs for finding a settlement. The Camp David accords are rejected in form and substance and will not become acceptable even if all the U.S. allies, agents and hirelings join French President Mitterrand in supporting them. The U.S. alliance against the Arabs' friends is rejected and condemned. The Israeli-U.S. conditions for a settlement are also rejected because they contradict the principles of the UN Charter and the pan-Arab interests of the Arab nation. Morever, no Arab can see any motive in accepting a U.S. relaxation in seeking or working for a settlement in the region.

Under the upset balance of forces between the Arabs and Israel, there can be no just settlement. All there can be is an Arab surrender to Israel. This is rejected by the Arabs and cannot lead to a just and lasting peace that removes the possibility of a future explosion in the region. The road to a just and lasting peace can only be paved through the establishment of a strategic balance in all fields and effective guarantees for the Arabs against Israel's threats with modern destructive weapons.

BEGIN, U.S. OFFICIAL DISCUSS SINAI AGREEMENT

TA071843 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin conferred this evening with Michael Sterner, who is the U.S. representative to the talks on the Sinai multinational force. They discussed the draft agreement, formulated in the last few months.

Political correspondent Shim'on Schiffer reported that it had been agreed that the main disputed issue will be resolved within 24 hours. According to the prime minister, there is some ambiguousness in the clause defining the status of the multinational force and the possibilities of its removal. According to the draft agreement, this pertains to a time in which there will be no need for the multinational force, or when one of the parties asks that it be replaced by a UN force. Mr Begin demands that it be stated clearly that no change be made in the force's status and that its troops not be removed from the area without a clear agreement on this by Israel and Egypt. The prime minister similarly wishes to amend various other phrases in the agreement in a way that would prevent moves that would not be agreed upon by Israel.

Our correspondent added that all of Mr Begin's requests have been accepted. Schiffer noted that Egypt has been pressing for a speedy conclusion of the agreement because it wants to begin negotiating on the future of the Sinai installations that will be transferred to it from Israel.

It has been reported from Cairo that the disputed clause in the agreement on the multinational force was discussed today between the Egyptian foreign minister, Kamal Hasan 'Ali, and the U.S. ambassador to Cairo. Sources in the Egyptian Foreign Ministry have said that no progress was made.

BEGIN, ABU-HATZERA DISCUSS COALITION TERMS

TA081038 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin met this morning for a 1-hour talk with Minister Aharon Abu-Hatzera to discuss Tami's terms for joining the coalition. On his departure from the talk, Minister Abu-Hatzera told correspondent Arye Golan that Tami's position has not changed since the election campaign and that it favors the setting up of a coalition led by the Likud. The religious minister did not exclude the possibility that he would accept a different portfolio in the Cabinet but he emphasized that Tami saw in the Religions Ministry a very important office.

AGUDAT YISRA'EL RESPONDS TO COALITION PROPOSAL

TA080557 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0500 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Text] Agudat Yisra'el responded officially to Menahem Begin's proposal to set up a coalition with the Likud. The Agudat Yisra'el directorate elected a committee of five members representing every faction of the party, to formulate the demands on which the joining will be contingent. The committee will begin its sessions today and, before its terms are presented, they will be brought to the council of Torah sages for endorsement.

The disscussions in Agudat Yisra'el lasted for more than 6 hours last night, and most demands that were raised in their course had to do with religious legislation. There were, however, also proposals testifying to Agudat Yisra'el's desire to be involved also in other social issues, such as housing for young couples. A demand was also raised that Agudat Yisra'el be represented in government ministries but not at a ministerial level, because also this time the party will eschew portfolios.

PERES INTERVIEWED ON NATIONAL UNITY GOVERNMENT

TA071154 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] [Announcer] We will fulfill our duty as a responsible opposition as we did in the last 4 years. We will strive for advancing the elections but we are not impatient. This was Shim'on Peres' reaction to the possibility that the Likud will set up the next government. The party's bureau has unanimously rejected the NRP's proposal to set up a national unity government. At the end of the bureau's meeting, less than 1 hour ago, our correspondent on party affairs, Amnon Nadav, spoke with Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres.

[Begin recording] [Nadav] Mr Peres, now that the meeting of the Labor Party bureau has ended, is it clear beyond any doubt that the Alignment is not inclined to participate in a national unity government under any circumstances:

[Peres] The bureau decided that the proposal we received is unacceptable--and this is the decision. The results of the elections are of such nature as to give an edge to the Likud. However, in fact, the balance of forces is rather similar. Therefore, in a democratic regime what is required is that one of these forces try to set up a government which will fulfill the policy we announced and explained to the voter prior to the elections.

We explained and said that we are opposed to the way of the Likud movement. Why should we all of a sudden today say: Excuse me.

[Question] If a national unity government is not set up, do you foresee that the tension between the two large parties, the Likud and the Alignment, will continue?

[Answer] I cannot speak for the other parties. I can only speak for our party. I think that, in the face of the most serious provocations, insults and attacks, with the utmost restraint, all the more so considering that we were in the opposition, we will go on doing our best to maintain a cultured and civilized fashion in our debates. We will not go into provocative and dissentive styles. This is vital to the existence of a good democracy. On our behalf, I can tell you that this will be our way.

[Question] In case the Likud ultimately sets up the government, what are the missions that you envision for the Alignment in the near future?

[Answer] First of all, we will fulfill our duty as a responsible opposition as we did, in my opinion, in the last 4 years.

[Question] Practically speaking, will you strive for holding early elections if a Likud government is set up?

[Answer] The duty of the opposition is to bring about a change of government as soon as possible (?and with a majority). However, we will not act out of impatience.

[Question] Mr Peres, are you not apprehensive about dissent within the Labor Party, within the Alignment, after the climax of the last elections?

[Answer] I foresee another climax following this one. I want to remind you that 4 years ago it was said that the Labor Party was in fact finished for 30 years. There were very few people who believed that we would be able to regain our force. However, we did regain our force, a larger force than we had in previous Knesset terms. As far as the number of voters is concerned, the Labor Party gained a record number of votes since the establishment of the state.

[Question] You had meetings with Dr Burg and Zvulun Hammer. Do you regard the NRP [National Religious Party] as a partner in the coalition, today or in the future?

[Answer] First of all, I must express my appreciation of the proposals of Dr Burg and Zvulun Hammer. I understand and respect their motives. We have always had a partnership with religious Jews and with religious parties. We are not an anti-religious party. Also in the future we will seek the fullest possible partnership with the religious parties while respecting the religious needs of the Orthodox Jews. We differ on various issues but this does not make us into a nonreligious or antireligious party; but we are not a religious party either. Therefore, partnership--yes; appreciation--yes; and the answer--I have already given it to you. [end recording]

BEGIN, DAYAN DISAGREE ON AUTONOMY ISSUES

TA070939 Jerusalem POST in English 7 Jul 81 p 1

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin yesterday indicated openly that he intends to maintain a hard line on issues pertaining to autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and that he expects "to get away with it." This was the clear impression of the members of the Telem Party delegation, headed by Moshe Dayan, who met yesterday with the prime minister.

As he welcomed Dayan, the former foreign minister who was instrumental in achieving the Camp David agreements in September 1978, Begin told him "We received a mandate for Eretz Yisra'el (the land of Israel which includes Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip). The prime minister then went on to explain that, in his view, Israel was fully entitled to maintain the military government indefinitely in the territories, pending agreement in the autonomy talks.

When Dayan tried to refute Begin's argument, basing himself on the Camp David accords, the prime minister asked that the text of the agreements be brought to the meeting.

Begin then set out to prove that, in his view, there was no explicit commitment by Israel to withdraw the military government from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip under any circumstances.

When lawyer Ram Caspi of Telem attempted to support Dayan's argument, Begin retorted that he himself was a trained jurist and knew to interpret the Camp David accords.

The Telem delegation came away from the meeting with the impression that there was little chance that they could bridge the gap between Begin's hard-line view and Dayan's far more pragmatic approach, which caused him to resign from the Likud government in October 1979.

SHARON REPORTEDLY TO BE DEFENSE MINISTER

TA080751 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 8 Jul 81 p 1

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin has made a final decision to appoint Ari'el Sharon as defense minister in the next government he is to make up. This was reported yesterday by a senior, reliable government source. Mr Begin has recently hinted about this decision to Minister of the Interior Dr Yosef Burg and Israel's chief rabbi, Shlomo Goren.

Over the last few years Minister Sharon has applied a great deal of pressure for his appointment as minister of defense, but Mr Begin has not always been enthusiastic about the idea.

Even when he did tend toward it, he encountered strong opposition inside his Herut Party, from the Liberals and the Democratic Party. It appears that because of the formation of a government relying on the smallest majority, Mr Begin has made a final decision to appoint Sharon.

There is a report according to which Mr Begin was afraid that if he did not appoint Sharon to the post of defense minister, Sharon would decide not to support the government and thus foil its chance of gaining the confidence of the Knesset.

Despite this decision by Mr Begin concerning Minister Sharon's apointment to the post of defense minister, a group of senior members from Herut are still opposed to this appointment. The members of this group would prefer that Mr Begin himself continue in the post of defense minister.

Sharon's appointment to the post of defense minister strengthens his status in the fight to be Mr Begin's heir when the latter resigns from his post as prime minister.

TAMIR MAY BE NAMED AMBASSADOR TO WASHINGTON

TA071047 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 7 Jul 81 p 1

[By Ilan Kfir]

[Text] The former minister of justice, Shmu'el Tamir, may be a candidate for the post of Israeli ambassador to Washington, to replace the present ambassador, Efrayim 'Evron.

Shmu'el Tamir's name was raised in recent days in contacts between senior personalities in the Likud government. According to these personalities, the appointment of Shmu'el Tamir as Israeli ambassador to Washington is likely to be a successful choice, in view of his political qualifications, which gained expression during the autonomy negotiations.

The idea to appoint Mr Tamir as Israeli ambassador to Washington is not a new one and has been raised in the past, during the term of the previous government.

DRONE CRASHES 7 JUL DUE TO 'TECHNICAL PROBLEM'

TA071508 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1500 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] A drone on a patrol mission over Lebanon today crashed because of a technical problem. This was reported by the IDF spokesman.

Earlier, the Syrians had announced that they had downed an Israeli pilotless plane, but the Syrian Army did not specify how it had downed the aircraft.

Our military correspondent noted that in the last few months four drones were hit over Syria and Lebanon. The IDF has recently increased the use of such aircraft to decrease the possible danger to air force pilots.

JERUSALEM REPORTS ON SOVIET-SYRIAN EXERCISE

TA071638 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The entire Syrian Navy and units of the Syrian coastal defense force are taking part in the joint Soviet-Syrian exercise. Vessels are deployed over a broad area stretching from Cyprus to the Syrian coast. On the Soviet side, 15 vessels and several planes are participating in the exercise. Military correspondent Shmu'el Tal comments that the Syrian Army is taking the defensive role while the Soviet force is the attacker.

ALGERIA

'SOURCE' CITED ON SUPPORT FOR SAHARA REFERENDUM

NC072114 Paris AFP in English 2057 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Algiers, 7 Jul (AFP)--Algeria will adhere strictly to the recent decisions of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) on a referendum on self-determination for the people of the disputed Western Sahara, an authoritative Algerian source said today.

Algiers, which backs the Polisario guerrillas fighting Morocco for control of the territory, will also do its best to aid the commission charged with organising the poll, the source added.

The source said the commission--grouping Guinea, Mali, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanzania and Kenya--would meet before the end of August to study the problems of a permanent and obligatory ceasefire, the deployment of a neutral force to monitor it and the movement of opposing troops to designated camps.

The commission will also have the task of defining the qualifications of voters in the referendum.

The Algerian source refused to speculate on what the commission might decide but said its ruling should be "binding on everyone and without appeal."

The Algerian daily ASH-SHA'B stressed today that the commission would be able to "correct all false reading or misunderstanding" on the nature of the referendum.

An OAU committee originally proposed the idea and King Hassan II of Morocco said at the Nairobi summit last month that he had accepted it. He then told journalists invited to his palace that he saw the plebiscite not as a way toward self-determination but as a means of confirming Moroccan claims to the territory.

ASH-SHA'B dismissed the parallel recently drawn by the king with the 1962 referendum in Algeria on independence from France in a comment on Algeria's demand that Moroccan troops leave Western Sahara during the referendum process.

The king said that French troops had remained in Algeria in 1962. But ASH-SHA'B pointed out that the referendum there took place after direct negotiations between the Algerian National Liberation Front and Paris, while Morocco still refused to talk directly to the Polisario.

FLN CENTRAL COMMITTEE APPROVES POLITICAL BUREAU

LD022258 Algiers Domestic Service in French 2200 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Excerpt] The FLN Central Committee ended its work this afternoon. The closing session of this fifth session was marked by the orientation speech by the president of the republic and secretary general of the FLN. This last session was also marked by the adoption of the resolutions worked out by the commissions and the adoption of the constitution of the Political Bureau, which is composed of:

Messrs Rabah Bitat, Abdallah Belhouchet, Mohamed Ben Ahmed Abdelghani, Mohamed Cherif Messaida, Mohamed Ben Yahia, Mohamed Said Maazouzi, Boulem Ben Hamouda, Boualem Baki and Mohamed Yala.

LIBYA

ASH-SHAHATI CITED ON OAU SUMMIT, U.S. TIES

NC072106 Paris AFP in English 2051 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Paris, 7 Jul (AFP)--The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) showed "support for Libyan activities in Africa" with the resolutions passed at its recent summit in Nairobi, a Libyan official said here today.

Libya's African policy is aimed at unifying the continent and liberating it from "racist regimes like South Africa, and Zionist and colonial influence," added Ahmed ash-Shahati, Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's special envoy to the United States. Libya also wanted to free Africa economically from the influence of multinationals and from "cultural colonialism," Mr ash-Shahati said.

He was passing through Paris after a trip to Washington during which he renewed contact with U.S. Government officials after the expulsion of all Libyan diplomats in May.

"We are also working towards a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Saharan people's problem with Morocco. We consider that conditions are favourable at the moment for a beginning of direct negotiations between the two sides," Mr ash-Shahati added.

Libya, which looked like being heavily criticised at the OAU conference over the presence of its troops in Chad, escaped lightly and is hosting next year's conference.

Mr ash-Shahati also said that in its efforts to reunite Arabs Libya had reestablished diplomatic links with Morocco and Iraq, and was on the way to doing the same with Saudi Arabia. "The only beneficiaries of Arab splits are the United States and Israel," he added.

Mr ash-Shahati said Tripoli would like to talk with the U.S. "on an equal footing" but rejected any American interference in its internal affairs.

During his stay in the U.S. he had met officials of the State Department and members of the House of Representatives and Senate, Mr ash-Shahati said. "I told them that Libya was a non-aligned country, independent, strategically linked with the Palestinian cause, and that it intended to have balanced relations with all states and all peoples in the world."

The Libyan added, "We hope that Washington will reconsider the situation and change its policy towards Libya so that it can maintain its interests in Libya and the Arab world in general." If the U.S. persists in attacking Libya, Tripoli will reexamine its position with regard to Washington, Mr ash-Shahati warned.

PAPER ATTACKS U.S. CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM

PM071420 London AL-ZAHF AL-AKHDAR in English 26 Jun 81 p 2

[Untitled editorial]

[Excerpts] It is becoming increasingly obvious that the Americans are determined to force us to view events and ideas through the jaundiced prisms of their world perspective. This perspective sees the world divided into two parts: America and Russia with Europe seen as marginal to this dichotomy and the rest of the world as merely appendages of either side. With such a division, it is easy to see how moral and ethical values become ascribed to each side. Thus America would like to be viewed as the representative of good struggling against the evil influences of Russia and her allies.

The principal exponent of this American view is Alexander Haig, the U.S. secretary of state. Little does he realise that such a view is not grounded on a knowledge of U.S. history or an understanding of present American policies in the world. Or perhaps, he does but refuses to acknowledge the truth.

Not since the end of the Second World War has the USA stood on the side of a just cause. This is because America has not sought to make friends but to enslave the world. The recent history of the nation includes frequent attempts to decimate native populations, in an effort to institute political and economic domination.

It is the only power in the world to support the barbaric Zionist aggression against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. Under Ronald Reagan, the U.S. nation has adopted a Janus-like approach to other nations. Soon after the Zionist bombing Iraqi territory, the Americans suspended sales of four F-16 fighters. This was presented as a snub to the Zionists for their unwarranted attack but after the furor had died down the Americans revealed their true colours. In his first press conference after being shot, President Reagan justified the Zionist action by citing "reasons for concern" by the Zionist entity and the notion that the Zionist aggressors "might have sincerely believed was a defensive move."

America is the only country which defines people's liberation movements in a manner which contradicts historical logic and is incompatible with their definition by other nations. This insolence has prompted Washington to describe the struggle of the Palestinians as a terror campaign. The same logic is used towards the Namibian and Saharan peoples' struggle to achieve independence and freedom.

It is clear that the politicians and planners in Washington have failed to develop even an inkling of the reasons why people are prepared to die in defence of their soil, freedom and way of life. Little do they realise that self-sacrifice is a supreme act towards a noble goal. Ever since people's awareness started to take shape and crystallise in the world, man's task has been to wrest freedom from those who control destiny. The struggle for freedom all over the world is rooted in this basic desire.

Thus when the U.S. administration accuses Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi of being the spiritual leader of terrorism, it is merely trying to find a convenient scapegoat to divert world attention away from its own foul deeds. Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi is, in fact, the spiritual leader of the people's struggle to find and defend their final emancipation. Terrorism according to the thoughts of Haig is the people's struggle and so anyone engaged in developing that struggle is aiding and abetting terrorism.

The USA does not see the establishment of its military bases in the Arab homeland as an act of terrorism nor does it think that Zionist aggression against the Palestinian and Lebanese people is a terrorist act. This is not due to shortcomings on the part of those struggling against domination and aggression, but to the fallacies and erroneous premises on which American policies are based.

It should be evident to all peace-loving peoples that it is the USA and not Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi that is striving to put out the flame of freedom. The Americans apparently have not learnt their lessons from the debacles in Vietnam, Iran or Nicaragua. Why else would they want to repeat the same action in Guatemala, El Salvador and Grenada? Why else would they want to dominate Egypt, Sudan and Saudi Arabia?

Defeat in those areas are inevitable if the lessons of America's bloody history are not learnt.

MOROCCO

TEXT OF KING HASSAN 2 JUL PRESS CONFERENCE

LD042300 Rabat MAP in English 1210 GMT 4 Jul 81

[Text] Rabat, 4 July (MAP)--King Hassan II of Morocco granted Thursday July 2, 1981, at the Royal Palace in Rabat, a press conference devoted mainly to African problems, especially after the OAU's summit recently held in Nairobi. This conference gathered representatives of major French weeklies, radio and television stations, as well as journalists representing dalies from Great Britain, Spain, Portugal and Latin America. The Arab press was represented by the major London and Paris-based Arab press. Following is the translation of the text of the press conference:

Question: Sir, since you have spoken in Nairobi, perhaps you would like to tell us in what disposition you headed for Nairobi and how did you return.

Answer: I went to Nairobi with the firm will to rid Morocco of this "unique de nessus" which was glued to any dialogue concerning the Saharan problem.

This is the state of mind I left with, and I returned thanking heavens for having fulfilled my mission and for having finally made African and then international public opinion understand Morocco's true stance and the limits of how far it could go to please --in a just and complete manner--first our African brothers, then those among my friends the heads of state who had kindly written me on the issue, and finally international public opinion.

Question: (Christian Moche from L'EXPRESS) Your Majesty, I would like to know why this year, in 1981, in Nairobi, you have accepted the principle of a referendum, while earlier you had refused it?

Answer: In fact, I have never refused the referendum. I had refused certain aspects of the referendum, in other words self-determination. The referendum is, as you know, an act of internal sovereignty. Self-determination is a juridical act which does not necessarily prove the existence of a sovereignty over the territory in question.

On the other hand, you must have noticed the crescendo tone in the recommendations made at the OAU. The first were violent and thus (?unacceptable), not for me but for my country's dignity, as much as the recent recommendations of Freetown are ones that take into consideration the African context, it is true, but which also take into consideration the prestige and the history of my country. These are the reasons that made me accept the referendum this time in Nairobi.

Question: Your Majesty, this year, however, you have accepted a referendum of self-determination, because I think the resolution mentions a referendum of self-determination?

Answer: Yes, a referendum is always a referendum to have self-rule, but in my mind it is a confirmative referendum. I do not believe that the Moroccan populations of the Sahara will renounce during this referendum, all the occasions they seized to express their adherence to the whole Moroccan community, through the renewed oath of allegiance to the amir of the believers, nor that they will appear to be in contradiction with their massive participation in the elections, whether parliamentarian or communal. For this reason, in my opinion, this is a confirmative referendum.

Question: (Charles Hagrover from the "TIMES") Are you satisfied that Libya stopped granting its strategic and military support to the Polisario?

Answer: We have not arrived to that yet. I hope that Libya, as long as it wants to be logical with itself, adopts the same attitude on the field as it did in Monrovia and the one it publicly claims to be its own--in other words, put aside differences opposing it to the Arab countries for the sake of the Arab unity now found again.

So, if Libya wants to remain logical with itself, and I personally hope so, it will reach this conclusion. But, God forbid, if it continued as in the past, to grant assistance (to the Polisario), it will be a lost and aimless thing because I do not see what it can change.

On the other hand, it is certain that from the moment dispositions for the cease-fire and preparations for the referendum are completed, I do not think that the Polisario armed by Libya or somebody else, will still be able to make incursions and provoke international public opinion. So, in Libya's interest, and in order that it remains logical with itself and avoid vain efforts, it is desirable that it stops there. But if it did the opposite, it will not unduly bother us.

Question: (Josete Alia from the "NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR") I would like to ask you if there was an institutional connection between the cease-fire and the referendum. In other words is the cease-fire an obligatory prerequisite. If the cease-fire was violated, could the referendum be organized, since such a violation could hinder the referendum?

Answer: Indeed, the referendum needs peace and serenity as long as we all firmly wish that consulting the Sahara populations be serene, virtuous and true to reality. Everybody's interest will be that calm reigns in the region. So the cease-fire is a condition which is all the more serious for those who would violate it. At that moment, it will be evident that the very ones who violated it, be it the Moroccans or the others, are the ones who dread this face to face meeting and this minute of truth, this meeting with the populations' will.

So in my opinion, the cease-fire is a guarantee granted by the parties in question that they will accept the verdict of the populations.

Question: Sir, could you tell us who will participate in this referendum and who the electors are?

Answer: It was absolutely necessary to start from an undisputed basis. Thank God the Spanish had, before leaving the territory of the Sahara made a census, a very precise census as it gave the name of the individual, his sex, the name of his father and mother, and the name of his tribe or the fraction of the tribe he belongs to. This register has become an international reference dossier. It is lodged at the United Nations and any nation can consult it. So it is on the basis of this list that we shall proceed to the census of the populations. There are those who are born between '75 and now, but those do not have the right to vote, so there is no problem here. It is certain that we shall need not only the help of the United Nations and the organizations and the Organization of African Unity, but also of the active good will of Algeria and Mauritania.

We shall ask that census bureaus under international control be opened so that we can at least find, wherever they are, those who are directly concerned by the referendum and by the electoral consultation.

Question: Majesty, was not it possible to obtain results as positive as those reached by Morocco in Nairobi if Your Majesty had participated in previous African conferences, or was it that circumstances were not appropriate?

Answer: I think that even if I had participated in the OAU's previous conferences, we would not have had more results than those obtained in Nairobi, as ambiguity and confusion were characterizing these conferences. Positions were not clearly defined. Morocco's position itself was not well understood. As the saying goes "everything in its due time." The essential is that we have reached the expected results.

Question: Majesty, can Spain or must it play a role in organizing the referendum in the Sahara?

Answer: Spain would have avoided us a lot of trouble if it had accepted to play its part before, mainly when the foreign minister of the previous government claimed that Spain had handed back to us the administration of the country but not the sovereignty. Doing so was making a distinction, I would not say subtle, arachnean, but sick and morbid.

The [International] Court of Justice of The Hague was consulted by the United Nations to know whether, before the Spanish colonization of this territory, the Moroccan Sahara was a "terra nullius". The court answered in the negative. So Spain had certainly taken this sovereignty from someone else as the "terra nullius" did not exist. The Court of Justice said that there were allegiance ties, i.e. ties of right between Morocco and the Sahara. So it was natural that Spain gave us back the administration as well as the sovereignty. This distinction had bothered us a lot. The ambiguous attitude of the Spanish Government of the time, more especially at the United Nations, did not help to settle nor to clarify things. For the moment, we think that Spain had granted us its support, as I received a letter from my friend and brother the King Juan Carlos I, as well as from his government, saying that Spain would be happy to see in the coming months, a peaceful settlement established in the Sahara.

I think that if a help is to be granted it would be later on. Spain knows this region very well on the geographical, geological and maritime levels. I think that many things can be done along with Spain later on. For the moment, we do not ask Spain to do more than it had already done.

Question: Sir, do you consider the populations gathered in Tindouf as Saharans? How are you going to determine their origin and are you going to make them participate in the referendum? To what extent and in which manner?

Answer: I have already answered this question. To participate in the referendum the populations that are not in the Sahara and who are in Algeria or in Mauritania, of course those who are still alive, must prove that their identity confirms to the register lodged at the United Nations and that had been homologated by Spanish officials before their withdrawal from the Sahara.

Question: Are you going to proceed with a census of these populations?

Answer: Not us. Although others want to interfere in our affairs, we have no right to go and interfere with affairs concerning others on their territory. We will merely ask the United Nations and the OAU commission with the help of Algerian authorities or Mauritanian authorities to list those whose identity is in conformity with what is in the register.

Question: The nomad populations were not included in the register established by the Spanish.

Answer: They were, in principle.

Question: These populations were included. What is your estimate of the populations of the Western Sahara?

Answer: According to this register and at that time, I do not want to give wrong figures, it did not exceed 74 to 75,000 inhabitants. Maybe less, maybe more.

Question: Did the internal situation in Morocco worsen or improve after the green march?

Answer: All Moroccans participated in the green march thanks to audiovisual technology, although only 350,000 of them marched. But what is more relevant for me is that this march has marked all those older than five. This reassured me for the future, for Morocco must not have a void in its demography as it were. The green march has not only marked the whole Moroccan population, but especially those who will have to take over and take in their hands Moroccan affairs. So Morocco remains what everybody knows, a wise country but still a Mediterranean one with its enthusiasms, anger and joys. All in all, a country and a people lively, full of vitality, really pleasant to orient and rule.

Question: Your Majesty, how long would the whole referendum process take? Do you have dates?

Answer: No, we have a date which is August 21, 1981, I believe. But for its part, Morocco, if it were up to it, would be ready within three or four months to organize the referendum. For us, it will consist of being a matter of agreeing with UN and OAU observers on the number of constituencies, the number of polling booths, the people to be registered, who reached voting age and who meet criteria recognized by all at populations registers established by the Spanish, free circulation for all international authorities who want to see if there was any pressure. These are things that show and that can be seen. So, if tomorrow the United Nations said to us: Listen, we are in a hurry, things have to be settled by the end of the year 1981, we would be ready within the next three or four months, but the other side, rather the two other sides, should be willing to facilitate the task of a census to international authorities.

Question: Your Majesty, do you think that the Saharan populations who are in Tindouf, once censused, could vote in Tindouf? Or should they enter the Sahara territory to vote?

Answer: In my opinion, the moment we are certain this person is the very one who should vote, if we consider and if the UN considers that the freedom to vote is perhaps more guaranteed by the voting in Tindouf, and on condition that we do not make the dead or the nonliving vote. [sentence as received] On the contrary, those who are in Tindouf, they are either held against their will and they will vote for us, or they are there because they want to remain. We have no need for whirlwinds which come troubling electoral operations underway. The important thing is that there be true identification and that there be no mistakes concerning people's identities.

Question: Your Majesty, do you think it possible to have a free electoral campaign within the Sahara? For example, a free electoral campaign of all?

Answer: Well, let us talk about the electoral campaign since we have to, although there is no such a campaign. The question which will be asked needs no advertisement. The question is, where does one want to be? Here or there? It is certain that if non-Moroccan persons come to stage an electoral campaign for secession, this will be an obvious attempt against internal order.

It will be our duty then to kindly turn them out by sending them back to their country. We did a great deal when we accepted the referendum, but we will never accept among us those who preach the secession. It is unacceptable.

Question: Can one imagine the formula of the question that will be asked in the referendum.

Answer: I have the formulation, but I will not give it to you. I do not want to give everything. I have not given it, not even to the Organization of African Unity.

Question: Your Majesty, we have the impression that Morocco has marked the Nairobi summit, the green march, the security belt and the wide diplomatic campaign. Can you imagine the future reaction of Algeria?

Answer: There is no doubt the Algerian attitude in Nairobi disappointed me a great deal, because what I had been told made me believe that Algerians only needed a moral justification for their attitude to renounce it and go back to the status quo ante of fraternity and cooperation. Several African and Arab heads of state have told me that the Algerian officials and government have inherited this problem and that it was difficult to renounce it, especially when some African and non-African countries have followed Algeria in this issue and that once the consultation was over they would return to better dispositions.

I was disappointed, but this is not a final attitude for nothing is final in life. Everything can again be settled. I was disappointed to see that instead of congratulating me and saying we are attached to consultation and now that you have accepted we will be happy it is Morocco which will be there, because Morocco we at least know as a state and thus the future is guaranteed. There will be no adventurism and we will help in carrying out the census of the peoples and close frontiers, for Algeria has no interest to see the creation of a mini state of 75 or 100 thousand inhabitants which has no resources whatsoever between Morocco and Algeria.

So, I was expecting a kind of liberation from the Algerian Government. It was in vain. For the Algerian delegation wanted to oust the Moroccan administration and to oust the Moroccan Army. This is unthinkable. Unthinkable because first inapplicable. I cannot tell a Moroccan to quit the Sahara. First, my mouth will not utter the word, and even if I do it will be the first and last time I will not be obeyed. Secondly, I cannot imagine a Moroccan climbing on a public building and bringing down the Moroccan flag. Thirdly, it will really be a heresy in international usage for even in Algeria itself the French Army did not leave and the FLN did not exact their departure. In Zimbabwe the army did not leave, in Djibouti the army did not leave so the Algerian Government saw it its duty to produce in Nairobi these conditions which are unacceptable and unaccepted.

All those present, the heads of state, officials and wisemen, very well know that this was impossible to do. Indeed, if Morocco did not withdraw its army, nobody can oust the Moroccan Army. This has never been done. Even Algerians did not ask for it during the referendum in Algeria at that very time and whenever a policeman met a resistant in the Sahara or the mountains, he would shoot him. It was not even the truce of God.

Then I do not understand why people ask me for something they have never asked for themselves and which nobody has ever been asked. This is why the Algerian attitude disappointed me. It disappointed me at the level of feelings for of course, on the practical level, their attitude made no difference. For our part, I have already said it, we have cast away our "tunique de nessus." It is over. If the United Nations tells us they want a referendum in three months, we are ready. In spite of all this, I still have hope the Algerians would adopt a more realistic attitude.

Anyway, I will do my best to avoid maintaining Algerians in their stubbornness which can harm the two countries. Finally, Morocco in its place and Algeria in its place for, as Bismarck used to say, geography is the sole permanent imperative of politics and we cannot help it.

Question: How do you interpret their attitude?

Answer: First of all, I am not "Madame Soleil." It is said that there are two tendencies in Algeria. The hardliners and those who are for dialogue.

This attitude can be explained by the prevailing of the hard liners. But if I were the president, and I am not, I would give the hardliners a mark of zero for Algeria remained isolated and I maintain it has its group of the "six" or "seven" with it.

Finally, twenty-six countries have recognized the Saharan republic within the OAU. Only six took the floor, and this is highly important.

So I believe it is the Arab, African and Islamic interest of Algeria, and I ask it in all humility and comradeship to reconsider its attitude.

Question: Majesty, we, from time to time, hear of secret contacts between Morocco and Algeria, but we do not know the reason why these contacts are cut off.

On the other hand, which future do you foresee for your relations with Algeria once the Sahara issue is settled? Shall Morocco accept to concede a corridor on the Atlantic Ocean to Algeria? Is Morocco ready to associate Algeria in the exploitation of phosphates?

Answer: Indeed, there have been contacts between Morocco and Algeria at the highest level.

These contacts have not reached what has been expected, always for the existence of two currents, of two attitudes, in Algeria. Now, concerning the future, if Algeria wants a passage to the Atlantic, we have to build both of us the railway or the trans-Saharian. If Algeria wants a port, it must be surrounded by barbed wire so there would not be a problem of customs. I can give it a free tax port on the Atlantic. If it wants to be associated to the phosphates I will be the first to associate it. If it wants, besides Tindouf, the tail end of the deposit of Tindouf which is in our Sahara as rich or even richer than the Tindouf deposit itself be exploited by both of us. I see no inconvenience. [sentence as received]

I have never put the problem of the Algerian cooperation on the one side and the problems of sovereignty on the other hand. One must not forget that I belong to a school which goes back 30 years. It is the Mohamed V school, it is the school of General de Gaulle when he said to Roosevelt: I will not go and see you on your boat. The sovereignty in our country, the prestige, what maintains a people is a priority. The rest, gas, oil, phosphate, iron--all these are but contingent.

And they know that we are entirely ready to make all these things. It is perhaps for this reason they would have liked that the Sahara belonged to someone else rather than Morocco. Finally, we are the best placed to guarantee security of installations. Personally that is what I think.

Question: Sir, the resolution of the Nairobi talks of involved parties in the conflicts: Could Your Majesty name these parties?

Answer: Well, the parties in conflict. It is Algeria that wanted things to be this way. We are going to name the things by their names. It is Morocco, Algeria and the Polisario.

Algeria insisted that the word Polisario be included on the recommendation. We have refused because first of all it is a word that is not recognized in the African deontology. The Polisario Movement is not admitted in Africa, and the headquarters of the liberation movements is in Tanzania and we know that President Nyerere, president of Tanzania, even if he is a member of the wisemen committee, has been one of those who had recognized the SDAR (Saharan Democratic Arab Republic). Despite this, we accepted him as a referee, and despite this he made the interventions he wanted to make in Nairobi.

Well, the Polisario Movement is not inscribed on the lists of the liberation movements recognized in Africa. They wanted to make one believe it. It is wrong, it does not exist. Thus, I do not see why I would accept to mention in a recommendation an identity which does not exist. Unfortunately, Algeria was saying before me, it is an affair between the Polisario and Morocco. It is not my affair, as soon as Morocco will give the populations the right to say what they think, I will have no problem. But it appeared that his attitude, once set back [as received] has been different and we regret it.

Question: Sir, can we ask you on the internal situation and in particular, your judgement on what had happened in Casablanca, its causes and impact?

Answer: I will tell you this in two words. I am a believer, I like knocking on wood.

Since 1965 we had not had serious problems. Anyway in this Mediterranean region, be it in the south or in the north, it is a good performance for us, and 2,000 demonstrators is nothing serious.

Question: Your Majesty, after the Moroccan-Mauritanian agreement, one had the impression it was an alliance rather than an agreement between two countries, but it is an alliance without arms. How can Mauritania be saved from instability?

Answer: It is for sure that only Mauritania can save Mauritania. But if I were a sociology professor and had to give a lecture in politics as the fashion goes, I would say that in a country where men carry their homes on the back of their camels, where poets both in Arabic and Hassania thrive, where the intellect and men are free, it would be provocation to have one single party in the country. It is a matter of psychology for here even the tribal element comes into play. Colour also comes into play, you have blacks, you have brown people, you have Moorish people and so on.

All of course necessitates an eloquent democracy which can express itself and express itself well. The single party system, in my opinion, is a major element in the instability of Mauritania. Of course, all this solely concerns the Mauritanian people.

Question: Sir, you have earlier said about the Casablanca events that 2,000 demonstrators was no serious matter. Does it mean that you opt for clemency, or on the contrary for repression?

Answer: I believe, Madam, we should not be prejudiced. In Morocco powers are separated. The clemency of the king, as it is for heads of state, can intervene only after the verdict of the courts. When I said it was not serious I meant: The acts were serious for they were aimed at private property, the state's property, the peace of the citizens' daily life. More than this, all the casualties were listed in highly populated districts and among the lowest class.

Later, persons were arrested and have been tried this morning, some of them are well known for their disorder activities, and half of the 2,000 arrested are recidivists.

It is not their fault. I wholly concede it. We have to reconsider our problems. We do not maintain people in the countryside, we do not have enough technology institutes and we do not have enough apprenticeship schools. When a boy fails his exams in a primary or secondary school, he is stripped of all civil rights. I think we must prevent this and a good program of national education astride the technical, superior or primary teaching and the professional one can reassure me better than 100,000 policemen.

Now that the Sahara question I have carried on my shoulders for six years give more opportunity, we will, with the government, the elects [as received], the towns and regions, deal with demographical problems, especially the fixation of populations. We have decided on the creation of a baccalaureat in agriculture. These people are not responsible for everything. It was the fault of those who told them to burn and to sack. These recidivists did not spontaneously do it. We know who told them to and this is the business of the interior and justice. We will say our word at the end.

Question: Your Majesty, you have said that the Casablanca demonstrators acted at an auspicious moment. Does this mean that they were directed from abroad?

Answer: You know that it is always easy to say that such or such is directed from abroad. It is an easy excuse for anyone.... If things had been more serious, I would have cancelled my trip to Nairobi. I assure you that if I had not been to Nairobi, and I say so in all humility, the "SDAR" might have been recognized by the OAU, but an OAU from which Morocco, Senegal, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Egypt and other countries would have withdrawn. So the "SADR" would have been recognized by a part of the OAU. The OAU would have been split up and nobody would have been satisfied.

I do not say that they were directed from abroad, but if abroad had wanted to guide them, it could not have found better conjunctures. Anyhow, even if I do not want to interfere in the affairs of justice, I personally wish that this element, the action from abroad, would not be referred to by attorneys general in the charges, because even if this was true, I do not want to admit that a Moroccan can be manipulated from abroad.

Question: But Majesty, you think of a particular country?

Answer: No, really. It is for this reason that I do not even raise the question.

Question: Does Your Majesty intend to pay a visit to Spain before the holding of the referendum in the Sahara?

Answer: It all depends. I have anyhow a date with his majesty the king for September-October. I told you, I need three months to be ready for the referendum. I say three months because of Ramadan, otherwise it would have been two months.

Question: Majesty, you have said that the referendum will be confirmative. But after the referendum, God forbid, if acts of violence are carried on, can one imagine your attitude then?

Answer: As we say in Arabic, the actions of the wise are sheltered from turpitude. If we accept a referendum controlled by the United Nations and by the OAU, if the results are achieved in peace, non-violence and non-ambiguity, there would be no more problem. If we have incursions then it would really be an international cassus belli. We can then ask for United Nations forces.... But one will at least know where these people came from and will certainly condemn the country they come from. I do not think that the situation will remain the same, and I think that this is what confounded our adversaries.

They were not expecting us to propose the referendum. With this proposition, everything has changed. Once the referendum is finished, it will all be over. When I say I need two months, I have one wish. I want it all to be over.

Question: Sir, what interpretation do you give to the support of the United States and of President Reagan to your referendary policy?

Answer: The same interpretation I gave to President Mitterrand when he tells me he is satisfied, to King Juan Carlos, to Mrs Thatcher, to the president of Italy, to the West German chancellor, to King Khalid and King Husayn, to Shaykh Zayid, to President Saddam and to all my friends of Africa. I do not see why we should give it a particular significance. The tone is particular, but I give it no particular significance. I only know that Morocco is proud to have friends in all continents, from all races, colours and religions.

Question: Sir, you held a press conference three weeks or a month ago and at that time there was a change of government in France, a change of regime, as it were. Was the concern you have expressed and which was implicit in your words of that time dissipated by what has been done and said ever since?

Answer: In fact, the concern I had following the change of president was not caused by the president himself but by his party or a wing of his party which even had physical attitudes by going to Algiers and meeting certain persons.

I very well knew (for I have known him for a long time, I have known President Mitterrand since 1956) that Mr Mitterrand of the opposition would not be the Mitterrand at the French presidency.

Anyway, even this possibility of doubt did not last more than a few days and the attitude of France was marked in a clear and unequivocal four-page letter on the position of the French Government. Indeed, I feared certain wings of the Socialist Party, to a certain extent.

Question: Sir, you have said that Mr Valery Giscard d'Estaing was your friend. Will President Mitterrand also be your friend?

Answer: It is certain that with President Valery Giscard d'Estaing we only had a difference of three years of age, but if President Mitterrand accepts, we will be such. He will be my senior and I see no reason why this could not be. He likes history, so do I. He is a cultivated person, so I am, not as much as he is but I believe [myself] to be to a certain extent. We are both humanists and we have known each other since 1956.

We have not seen much of each other since but we made acquaintance at Mr Gisard's in 1956 with Mr Gaston Deferre. And when there has been tension between Morocco and France, during the hailing of the plane carrying Ben Bella for example, thank God, he was not in the government. So if he wants us to be friends, he is the senior. It is up to him.

Question: I want to go back to Libya. Morocco severed diplomatic relations with Libya when it recognized the Saharan republic. You have just said that Libya was not ready to give up its support to the Polisario.

Answer: No, I have said Libya has not given me the formal pledge to give up the Polisario, but I can deduce it might give it up.

Question: You did not have any formal pledge. Then can you tell us on which basis you have accepted reconciliation with Libya since you are soon to exchange ambassadors?

Answer: First, it was president Al-Qadhdhafi who sent me Mr Yasir 'Arafat to say we must forget everything although we still have divergences and I answered that as far as the Arab cause was concerned we completely agreed, but when Mr 'Arafat wanted to talk to me about the Sahara, I immediately stopped him saying the Sahara was a Moroccan affair. He who does not have something cannot give it so neither you nor Libya have the Sahara to give to me and furthermore, if Morocco had to get the Sahara from your hands, Morocco would hand it back to you.

That was what I told the Libyan emissary. I told him we belonged to a school which believed that rights are to be snatched, they are never offered. That was what I used to say while in a demonstration when I was fourteen. I let the president know that if he wanted to help me, I was ready to accept his vote and the ones of his friend at the OAU, the United Nations and at the non-aligned.

I also said about the Polisario that nobody could better help Moroccans than Moroccans and that all Moroccans were good for the rebuilding of Morocco.

Question: Did relations change between Morocco and its northern neighbour since the arrival of Mr Calvo-Sotelo?

Answer: I will answer you frankly and briefly: I will not say why, but these relations have greatly changed.

Question: Will the Moroccan Armed Forces be withdrawn from the Sahara during the holding of the referendum?

Answer: No.

Question: Will Morocco insist on the cease-fire as a practical and natural condition for holding the referendum?

Answer: The cease-fire is not a condition for the validity of the referendum but it is a compulsory condition. The referendum can be better guaranteed if it takes place in no agitation. Anyhow, troublemakers will be condemned by the United Nations and by the OAU.

Question: Mexico is among the countries that have recognized the SDAR. I think that Mexico acted in conformity with its principles of international policy. But was not it also because of Morocco's absence in Mexico and in Latin America in general?

Answer: You are right, Madam. We are absent from Latin America, and as you said, it is in its international traditions, Mexico was the only one to recognize the Spanish republic. I think he has not yet disowned it? He has denounced it. Well, one must not give in. One must have time. In fact, we are absent but one must not forget that Latin America is a huge continent.... But this is not enough to explain our absence.

Question: Your Majesty has no guarantee from the former Portuguese colonies in Africa to reconsider their stance regarding the Sahara after the referendum proposition?

Answer: I must say that we have not had luck with the former Portuguese colonies. With Angola, the affair of Shaba and of Zaire is still present in minds. When President Mobutu asked for our help, the Angolans thought it was against them, but in fact it was not against them. Incursions were uncontestably coming from Angola but we did not go to wage war against Angola. We went there to support a legitimate regime.

Regarding Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, I still do not know the reason for which there is a misunderstanding and even a kind of animosity against Morocco. At the OAU summit, most of them were French speaking, so the language fact would have brought us close together, but it did not work. At least one can explain Angola's stance.

Question: Isn't there an ideological link between these countries?

Answer: Which countries?

Question: Between the six, between themselves, because those you have cited have almost the same regime.

Answer: I want to offend nobody, but I do not think that there is ideology in this affair. In these countries, you have the single party, the single trade unions. You cannot call this popular democracies. They are maybe populous but not popular.

Question: Majesty, you said that you would not allow that a foreigner to undertake a campaign for the secession in the Sahara, but would you allow a Saharan, censored the way it was done by Spain, to undertake the campaign?

Answer: I say nothing. I am fair play. I let go. A Moroccan has the right to say to others, no, because for me they are Moroccans. I am convinced the referendum will be confirmative. That a foreigner tells people, do not be Moroccans--this, no. But a Saharan can say so.

Question: When Spain made the census in 1974, were there refugees on the other side of the frontiers?

Answer: No, not yet, because there is something very important I would like to explain. Spain did not make the census to leave the Sahara. It made it to hold a referendum. The census was made for the referendum and I realized then that Spain was going to make us before an accomplished fact with the jemaa which would have been the bailee of the sovereignty. [sentence as received] This same jemaa was later on contested by Spain, by Algeria and by everybody, but this has no importance. It was at this moment that I immediately referred the matter to the International Court of Justice to prevent Spain from undertaking the referendary process. When the United Nations accepted the procedure, Spain could no longer hold the referendum. So the census made by Spain is the ideal one. It was not made to leave or to deceive. That is why we refer to it.

The census was made in 1974, but among the most unbelievable things as I had said in the OAU, is that I challenge the Polisario or those who support it to announce in the face of the whole world, a single Spanish who received a bullet, I do not say died, from the Polisario. There is not a Spanish civilian or a soldier injured by the Polisario. It does not exist. It appeared after the green march. [paragraph as received].

Question: Is the Polisario a creation of Spain?

Answer: The Polisario is the creation of Spain, of Algeria and of Mauritania.

The Mauritanian minister of internal sovereignty then, Mr Ahmed Ben Mohamed Salah, said later, a few months before the coup of July: "If I had only known, if I had been in confidence with Morocco, I would not have created the Polisario."

On the other hand, in 1974, Mr Lopez Bravo, foreign affairs minister, paid frequent visits to Colonel al-Qadhdhafi. These are Libyan revelations.

Question: Majesty, a question on Chad. Al-Qadhdhafi was pleasant concerning your proposition on the Sahara, and you were not too hard on Chad. How do you see the situation in Chad?

Answer: No, you see, I have no policy of give and take concerning the main principles.

I did not deal with Chad because I considered the affair was almost over, I felt it would end with almost the absolution of the Libyan president.... In fact, Africa did not condemn, there were strong speeches but the recommendations on Chad include no condemnation of Libya. Even the forthcoming summit of the OAU will be held in Tripoli although most Africans were against the idea.

Question: Will Libya withdraw from Chad within the year?

Answer: Libya played on the fact that unlike the OAU, it has money. Libya said: I withdraw, bring your troops, men and arms, pay them and I leave.

Nobody came. We who have been to Shaba know what it means. Up to now, nobody took into consideration the expenditures of Morocco during that period. No African country, neither individually nor in a group, dared to come.

Question: You are almost resigned now.

Answer: I am never resigned. I think that if Chadians want to be occupied once more, it is up to them.

Question: Sir, a great deal has been said about Saudi Arabia in the Sahara affair. Less than a week ago, you yourself have been there. Can you give us some precisions, some details on the role of Saudi Arabia in the Sahara affair now and in the future?

Answer: First, I give you this technical detail: Even if there had not been the question of reconciliation between Morocco and Mauritania, I would have made a stopover in Saudi Arabia for a technical detail; an eight-hour flight necessitated refuelling and whenever I am not very far Saudi Arabia, I go there. Saudi Arabia has ever since been concerned over discord between Islamic and Arab countries especially between Morocco and Mauritania. It has always acted as a cushion of air to soften shocks. This time it has asked us to have a written document to guarantee stability. Having no reason not to settle matters with Mauritania, I have accepted. Mauritanians have accepted too. Accords were concluded.

Question: (Nabil Moghrabi from AL-WATAN AL-ARABI) Majesty, after the Israeli aggression against Tammuz, some African and even Arab states stressed the importance of nuclear technology. Is Your Majesty for or against the entry of the nuclear weapon in Africa and in the Middle East?

Answer: I am not for the entry of the nuclear weapon where it does not exist, but it is certain that concerning armament and even nuclear armament a certain equilibrium is necessary. If there is no equilibrium, there is no limit, and if there is no limit, the door is open to aggression. We all know that Israel has several atomic bombs. I said in one of my press conferences a few months ago that if I were the Israeli Government I would either negotiate or I would throw an atomic bomb on every Arab capital, because in two years everybody will have its own bomb. Arabs should not be held for less intelligent than they are. They have also scholars studying in Europe, in America, in Northern Europe. If out of one thousand eight hundred reach no results, at least two hundred can fabricate this bomb.

Besides, Arabs have money, money and brains. In two years, things will be equal. Israel's atomic supremacy will no longer exist.

Question: Does Morocco make efforts on this level?

Answer: We do not want to make an atomic bomb. We want to install nuclear plants because we have the uranium extracted from phosphates. As we have almost 1,200 years of phosphates ahead, we think that we have almost 1,200 years of uranium.

I do not take into account the phosphates of Bu Craa in the Sahara. This field only produces 3 million tons when we produce 20 million. So it is not the small field of Bu Craa that justifies our stance concerning the Sahara. With what we already possess (the most important reserves in the world) we intend to create nuclear plants to face the energy costs.

Question: Sir, what do you think of relations between Morocco and Great Britain, because certain press pretends that they are not good and criticize your country?

Answer: Relations between Morocco and England are excellent. During the queen's visit, some wanted to create stories that did not exist: that I abandoned her in the desert, that she was offered to eat pigeons that were just killed by falcons. Besides this press, relations are excellent and when I sent my emissaries to Mrs Thatcher, she warmly welcomed them although she was busy with the funerals of those who had died following the hunger strike. Her stance over the Sahara was really cordial.

Question: Sir, you said that you have received a four-page message from President Mitterrand. Was it after Nairobi?

Answer: It was before as I cited this in my speech before the OAU summit.

Question: Afterwards, you did not receive a French reaction?

Answer: We had the declarations of Mr Claude Cheysson.

Question: And no other reactions from Francois Mitterrand?

Answer: Yes, but not public reactions.

Question: Sir, it seems that Francois Mitterrand wants to privilege [as received] the case of Jerusalem. The settlement of the problem of Jerusalem would be a good prelude for the rest. According to him this is what appears from the interview he granted to LE MONDE. Do you agree with this new French approach?

Answer: All depends on the way the problem of Jerusalem is settled. If the settlement takes into account that Jerusalem like the other Arab occupied territories was occupied by force, and if from the start it deals with this illegality it is certain that the settlement of the problem of Jerusalem would be the best prelude to settle the others. If you want to settle it in another context, I do not see how you can manage to.

Question: Your Majesty, do you think that in order to appease current social tensions you would advise your government to go back on its decision which raised prices and which was at the origin of strikes?

Answer: I cannot, Madam, for several reasons. I confess, and this is a governmental affair, that the raise in prices was, I will not say ill-timed. Raises always are directly and too much harming low incomes. The equalization fund whose budget is every year decided by the house of representatives could not meet its obligations because prices have increased everywhere in the world between January and June. The government could not raise money without the parliament and was thus compelled to raise prices. Later on, half of the raise was renounced, and I do not believe we can go any further. Oil and wheat prices have increased in the world, and these the government has to buy.

There are two solutions to settle this price issue. First, cense [as received] all consumers and needs and buy from abroad or produce only this quantity, give vouchers, and I immediately lower prices but then will start speculation when I do not want to have in my country a state of permanent cheating.

So Morocco has to produce more to meet its needs, and to export it must find energy.

We have found gas today, I thank God. We have started digging today in the Gharb. We hope to find something important. The number of gas wells is growing important besides the oil shales as you know.

Question: Sir, are not you afraid that if you do not touch prices, the causes will produce the same effects anew?

Answer: I do not think so, because in fact, what happens is that some talked of the prices but it was only a pretext to create agitation, an agitation that only concerned Casablanca and that was itself located within Casablanca. The following day there was a general shame. We accept protests, but why looting? I would have tolerated a demonstration of one million persons going from a place to another led by their syndical or political leaders. This we accept because we were brought up in this. We fought that way. We acquired our rights that way. But to say to people, go on loot, steal, I think that this is not an education to give a people, either a developing one or a developed one.

Question: Will the Casablanca events lead you to review your position regarding the democracy you have chosen?

Answer: Democracy is not for us a formal thing. It is something we have chosen, we respect and we shall respect for the simple reason that when a people has chosen a path it is difficult for it without changing its opinion to choose another path.

To one does [as received] not change his choices and options for a riot in a district, it would be an odious [word indistinct] to cast at the face of a people. For us democracy is not an end in itself, it is a means to avoid making mistakes or at least making only few mistakes. A man surrounded by a partisan team cannot handle all the problems. Without the contribution of all, nothing can be controlled, oriented and even less created.

The day Morocco will live under the regime of the German lands this day will be the happiest in my life, because I believe that the lands system frees the state from minor problems. This would be the best formula for Moroccans as I know them so varied and so united at the same time. [sentence as received] I thank you very much for your revelant questions.

SUDAN

ROSE AL-YUSUF INTERVIEWS NUMAYRI ON EGYPT, ARABS

PM030930 Cairo ROSE-AL-YUSUF in Arabic 29 Jun 81 pp 6-9

[Interview given to unnamed correspondent by Sudanese President Ja'far Muhammad Numayri--place and date not given]

[Text] A new campaign of slander against Sudanese President Ja'far Muhammad Numayri is bound to begin today, or tomorrow at the latest. The reason is the unexpected new call which the Sudanese president has elected to make for the first time in this issue of ROSE AL-YUSUF: "I call now for the immediate return of the Arab League to Cairo."

We did not expect such a surprise in the interview with the Sudanese president.

The storm he raised by his call for an Arab summit to be attended by Egypt has not abated yet. The purpose of the interview, which extended into three meetings, was to explore what chances this call has of succeeding. The most important question we asked was: Was the call for a summit preceded by soundings of the views of the Arab states or some of them?

The Sudanese president did not regard this question as important. He simply said: The Arab situation at present does not require soundings of the views of this side or that, but a reassessment of the present situation by everybody. Have the Arabs gained by boycotting Egypt? Has Egypt gained? Has the cause of Palestine gained? Has anybody other than Israel gained? Furthermore, have the Arabs really boycotted Egypt? Or have their relations with it strengthened on all levels--economically, culturally and commercially--and has their boycott been merely an ostensible official political stand? Moreover, what would be the future of the Arab world--and not only the future of Palestine--without Egypt, if all efforts are devoted to isolating it and antagonizing it? How much time and effort and how many millions are spent in all arenas and in various conferences in order to deprive the Arabs of Egypt's strength and Egypt's role? Any objective assessment of the present Arab situation and any sane evalutation of the Arab nation's strategic future would clearly show that the policy of "boycotting Egypt" is a negative policy and denotes a continuation of the same negative mentality that has caused the Arabs to lose such a great deal so far.

[Question] Mr President, what do you mean by "negative mentality?"

Numayri said: I mean the state of continuous retreat whenever we are faced with a challenge. Retreat is legitimate on the battlefield when your military forces fail, but it is not legitimate in politics. We Arabs have made retreat our primary political instrument and sometimes our only political instrument. Zionism wins America over to its side and we react by boycotting America; it wins West Germany over to its side and we react by boycotting West Germany. In both cases we continue to deal with the two countries commercially, exporting to them and importing from them, and are content with boycotting them politically, leaving the way clear for Israel to comfortably mobilize public opinion, rulers, leaders and parties against us, while we content ourselves with being angry and continuing to retreat.

[Question] Is it not legitimate for us to be angry when we feel that we are being treated unjustly?

[Answer] Yes, it is legitimate, but does it do any good? Let us put the question in a different way: Which is better, to translate your anger into retreat and boycott or into attack and confrontation?

Take France, for instance. It was France which participated in Israel's aggression against Egypt in 1956 and which armed Israel with Mirages, missiles and gunboats and set up the Israeli nuclear reactor in Dimona. Paris, more that Tel Aviv, has always been the capital of intellecutal Zionism. However, curcumstatnces dictated that De Gaulle adopt a stand against the 1967 Israeli aggression. The Arabs were encouraged and tried a policy other than the policy of retreat. The result was that France set up Iraq's modern nuclear industry and also condemned Israel's aggression against the nuclear reactor in Baghdad.

Or take Romania, for instance. Romania was the only socialist state to refuse to sever its political relations with Israel in the wake of the 1967 war. However, the maintenance of Arab relations with it and the political efforts made in the Romanian arena caused Romania to change its attitude gradually and to side with the Arab cause. Romania is now adopting stands toward the Arabs, the like of which the Soviet Union could not adopt even at the height of its friendship with Egypt and the Arabs.

What I want to say, briefly, is that we gained when we remained in the arena and lost when we withdrew from it. Despite this, we are still more inclined to withdraw, as if we refuse to benefit from our experiences and as if what concerns us is not to win our causes but to wash our hands of them, even if we lose them.

[Question] Mr President, is that not an exaggeration?

[Answer] I hope it is an exaggeration and that we have become so mature that this no longer applies to us. However, the most recent experience denotes the reverse: The Arabs have attacked Reagan since they heard him support Israel during the American elections. They have even contemplated boycotting France since Mitterrand won the presidency because he is Israel's friend. It is fortunate that they have not done so and have been prevented from boycotting the two presidents by the speed with which events were occurring. America under Reagan has for the first time voted in favor of a resolution condemning Israel, while Mitterrand began his presidency by postponing his official visit to Tel Aviv.

[Question] Are the Arabs still captive to the policy of withdrawal in your view?

[Answer] Very much so. The best proof and in my opinion the most serious evidence is their attitude toward Egypt.

[Question] How, Mr President?

[Answer] I will tell you how. The Arabs were once surprised by a new Egyptian strategy seeking to solve of the Arab issue through direct negotiations with Israel. We in Sudan were also surprised and angered by this shift. However, the nature of our special relationship and inseparable bonds with Egypt tempered our reaction and allowed us to ponder the situation more objectively. What did we discover?

We discovered that we, along with our Arab brothers, are engaged in a new withdrawal operation: Egypt has begun a dialogue with Israel, so we must withdraw from the dialogue arena; Egypt has reached an agreement with Israel, so we must withdraw from the arena of understanding. An Israeli ambassador has entered Egypt, so we must withdraw our ambassadors; the Israeli flag has been hoisted in Egypt, so we must withdraw our flags and also abandon the premises of the Arab League, which represents us--a process of continual withdrawal, as if God has decreed that whenever Israel enters a place our task is to withdraw voluntarily.

[Question] Mr President, does this mean that you are not pleased with the transfer of the Arab League from Cairo to Tunis?

[Answer] Yes. I even regard the transfer as a capitulation to Israel, a voluntary retreat before it and an abandonment of the arena to it. I believe it is a defeat that is as bad as the 1967 defeat, if not worse.

[Question] This is a very serious view, Mr President, because it means that Sudan will ask the Arab League to leave Tunis and return to Cairo.

[Answer] Do not say "will ask" but say that it is asking now that the Arab League return immediately to its original headquarters in Cairo. Those headquarters belong to it and it is its duty to remain there and cling to them.

The president added excitedly: I can understand our being dominated by the negative mentality of retreating in front of Israel in foreign countries like America, France or Romania, but not in Cairo, the heart of Arabism, which belongs to us. That I cannot imagine. I can imagine the Israeli flag being raised over the Israeli Embassy in Cairo with all the flags of the Arab League facing it and the Arab states continuing to hold their deliberations, to convene meetings of their representatives and to issue resolutions in Cairo--the same arena in which the Israeli ambassador is present. In this way we would at least be supporting Egypt in its "peaceful" conflict with Israel, influencing its policy and imposing our presence in the most important Arab arena--Egypt, whose fateful and decisive Arab role cannot be disputed by anyone.

[Question] Mr President, this is a completely new view.

[Answer] What is new in it? Is not Egypt our land, the land of the Arabs? Is it not natural that we should cling to it? Or is it natural, in your view, that we relinquish our position in it? This view is the only view consistent with the reality of our position regarding Egypt and Egypt's position regarding us. Any other view is deceptive and its price is paid by the Arabs and Egypt.

[Question] Mr President, can we make this public?

[Answer] Yes.

[Question] Have you thought of the Arab states' reaction to it?

[Answer] Yes. I believe that the Arabs, deep inside, will support it.

[Question] Have you thought of the Palestinian reaction?

[Answer] Deep inside, they will support it even more.

[Question] Why?

[Answer] Because the problem of the Palestinian revolution lies in the present disunity in the Arab arena. If they accept Egypt, Syria would be angry; if they appease Syria, Iraq would be angry; if they have a reconciliation with Libya, Tunisia would be angry. The result is that Yasir 'Arafat, is compelled to say in each Arab country the reverse of what he says in other Arab countries. The Palestinian revolution does not feel safe among the Arabs and therefore it is compelled to look for allies elsewhere--in Iran, in Moscow--and to support the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the Libyan intervention in Chad. It supports Eritrea today and Ethiopia tomorrow, dissipates its energies throughout the whole globe and bears the brunt of the problems of the whole world. It changes its attitude everywhere several times. It is compelled to do so because its basic asset, the Arab asset, is constantly disunited and incapable of defending it with a united, firm and guaranteed force.

[Question] But all the Arabs, despite their disputes, support Palestine, Mr President.

[Answer] This is true, but what use is it if those who support you are divided and preoccupied with fighting among themselves? The Palestinian revolution does not feel safe and it will not have a firm, clear strategy unless there is a minimum Arab understanding on which it can rely and under whose canopy it can fight, whatever the result may be. A Sudanese proverb says: "To die as part of a group is a blessing."

[Question] Mr President, do you not see that you are anticipating events by calling for the return of the Arab League to Cairo? Do you not see that this must be preceded by the Arab summit which you hope Egypt would attend?

[Answer] The return of the Arab League is one thing and the convening of a summit is another. My call for the return of the Arab League is based on the right of the Arabs to carry out their political action in Cairo and on the fact that the league's headquarters in Cairo belong to them and that it is naive to abandon those headquarters. As for the summit, convening it requires a lot of work and cannot be achieved by mere visits to capitals or by letters to kings and presidents.

[Question] Then how do you plan to achieve this task?

[Answer] I believe that the Arab people must be invited to participate in this matter. All those who have an interest in ending the present Arab disintegration must join this call.

Popular organizations, parliaments and writers must be invited into the arena. We must hear the voice of the organizations of young people, women, intellectuals and parties on this matter. My call for the restoration of Arab solidarity and the ending of the estrangement with Egypt is addressed to the whole of public opinion, which can convince governments and turn the call from a hope into a reality.

[Question] How long do you think the attempt will take?

[Answer] I do not think it will take a long time. Arab public opinion has begun to feel the weight of this estrangement and to discover the futility of the present negative policy. It is fortunate that we have succeeded recently in resolving many of Africa's problems by pursuing a completely different policy. We entered Ethiopia while the Soviets were there and we succeeded. We held the first meeting of the Nile basin countries in Khartoum and it was attended by Egypt. We mediated between Somalia and Ethiopia and Somalia declared for the first time its readiness to reach an understanding on the outstanding border issues. The reason for our success in all these cases is that we shifted from a policy of retreat and boycott to a policy of attack and contact. Because the experiment has proven to be a success, we are determined to pursue it in the Arab arena as well.

[Question] Only for the sake of experimentation?

[Answer] No, but to benefit from previous experiments and experience. We have had enough negativity and withdrawal. Let us for once try to tackle our issues instead of boycotting them and letting others decide them at our expense.

[Question] But Mr President, you will not find a "starting point" at which the Arabs and Egypt can come together.

[Answer] Who says? The basic disagreement is over attitudes toward the Palestine issue. Egypt believes that the solution begins with Camp David while the Arabs want an international conference. Is that not so?

[Question] Yes.

[Answer] Then the disagreement is meaningless, because Egypt accepts an international conference. America, the Soviets and the Palestinians also accept it.

[Question] Are you sure, Mr President?

[Answer] Yes. I believe that this is the point of agreement from which the new process of understanding between Egypt and the Arabs can begin.

[Question] When?

[Answer] When all the parties begin the process of reassessing the present situation and reconsidering their gains and losses because of it.

[Question] When?

[Answer] I am not an astrologist nor can I read the palms of the Arabs. However, I am sure that their intelligence will not fail them forever. What binds them together is one thousand times stronger than what separates them.

We told President Ja'far Muhammad Numayri: We implore God to make your dream come true, Mr President. Say: Please God.

The president said: Please God.

The interview was over. Nothing else could be said after that invocation.

TUNISIA

PLO'S FARUQ QADDUMI ARRIVES IN TUNIS 7 JUL

NC071403 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1100 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The head of the PLO's Political Department, Brother Abu al-Lutf [Faruq Qaddumi], arrived today at noon in Tunisia from Paris following a 3-day visit to France. During his visit to France he met with French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson and a number of French officials and party representatives.

The French paper L'HUMANITE said today that Brother Abu al-Lutf received [name indistinct], a member of the French Communist Party's Secretariat General. The paper said that the aforementioned member reaffirmed the French party's support for the PLO. He noted the party's supportive attitudes toward the Palestinian people's firm national rights--including their right to establish an independent state.

JAPANESE DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT REPORTED

PM071518 Tunis L'ACTION in French 1 Jul 81 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Mohamed Mzali Receives Japan's Deputy Foreign Minister]

[Text] Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali had a meeting at the Kasbah Government Palace yesterday with Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Kazud Aichi in the presence of Foreign Ministry Secretary General Mahmoud Mestiri and Japanese Ambassador in Tunis Takiguchi Yoshisuke.

The talks related to questions concerning cooperation between the two countries, which is now developing at a rapid rate.

It should also be mentioned that Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Kazud Aichi left Tunis yesterday morning after a visit to Tunisia during which he was granted an audience by President Bourguiba. In addition, the Japanese deputy foreign minister had talks with several Tunisian officials, especially with planning and finance mininster Mansour Moalla and Foreign Ministry Secretary General Mahmoud Mestiri. These talks related to ways of strengthening Tunisian-Japanese cooperation.

Mr Kazuo Aichi was also received by Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi.

The Japanese deputy foreign minister was seen off by Japanese Ambassador in Tunis Mr Takiguchi Yoshisuke.

TANZANIA

NYERERE SPEECH VIEWS FOREIGN EXCHANGE PROBLEMS

EA072010 Dar es Salaam Domestic Service in Swahili 0745 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Speech by President Julius Nyerere at Peasants Day rally in Kigoma's Tanganyika stadium--live]

[Excerpts] Reports indicate that the rains continued into June in the areas we were worried about, so there is now hope of at least lessening the great fears we had with respect to those regions. The areas where millet was planted have harvested and even the areas where corn was planted seem about ready to harvest--not in enormous quantities, but quantities sufficient to ally our fears. So it appears that we are going to be able to harvest enough food [words indistinct] in the country. We shall have sufficient food, for together with the imported food, we do not have enough food in the country at all. [sentence as heard] We do not. But, because the harvest has not been as bad as we had feared, if we supplement it with the additional amounts we are receiving from outside, it appears that we do not have to fear famine. But we do not have food reserves. That is the present state of affairs which I thought I should explain on this occasion.

I now want to point out that we have problems affecting our economy--the food problem and foreign exchange problems. We are trying to get foreign aid and I must say, truly, there are nations which understand us well, understand our position, realize that our problems are genuine and that we need help, and they assist us. All those nations have been very steadfast; whenever we have had problems, they have helped us. We are currently holding talks with them and they are helping us.

There are others who do not help us and there is nothing wrong with that. They exist and we talk to them. I say they do not assist us. Now, in fact you cannot quarrel with any nation for not helping you, because it is not bound to help you. No nation is compelled to help Tanzania. Tanzanians, (?as I see it), any development is up to you, not up to anyone else. Accordingly, whenever someone comes along to help we must thank him. When someone else comes along and says he is not going to help us, I will not blame him at all. You cannot blame a country because it does not help you. The countries and organizations in the world we blame are those that decided in the first place, not to help us. It would be enough to end it thus. If they had said: You Tanzanians, because we regard your policies as foolish we will not help you, period. But they are confusing us. They are engaging in sabotage. [passage indistinct]

Currently we are explaining--this is the third year we are explaining--that each country in the world makes its own decisions on how to bring about development. We decided to try to bring about the kind of development which reduces the gap between the rich and the poor, and it is the poorest who do the work. Now, once such a decision has been made by a country, you could visit and find no very rich people there. But we have said that we in Tanzania do not confine our efforts to increasing wealth. We do not wish to simply increase wealth until the country is full of wealth. We have a second aim for that wealth. Wealth is naturally like light. Now you see the sun coming from this direction Now, it is natural that when light enters a room, darkness must disappear. It is absolutely impossible for light and darkness to coexist. Under normal circumstances, it would be fine if in a place where there was wealth, there would be no poverty. If only wealth were able to dissipate poverty as light disspiates darkness. But that is not the way it is. By capitalist tradition, it is possible for a country to be wealthy, but for the people to continue being poor. Wealth exists, but it is controlled by very small groups who use it to oppress others. Accordingly, a country has wealth alongside poverty, so wealth and poverty wrongly coexist.

And in those countries, as soon as you enter, you will see how wealth is [word indistinct] especially when you stay with those who are well off. You will see the way they dress, you will see their cars, you will see their houses, you will see their gardens, you will see that their overall lifestyle is very pleasant and you will be pleased. But you can be fenced off so that you do not see the poverty-stricken masses.

So you may feel pleased with their wealth, but sometimes you may be shown the poverty that exists as well. And you might say: You know, first a few will become very rich, and when this happens the few rich will be in a position to use some of their wealth and the rest will be left aside for the purpose of development. If you distribute all that you have, everyone will get very little and will use it up, and there will be none of this wealth left behind for development.

So, as they say, according to their systems, it is better when wealth is obtained that the majority should be deprived of it and only a few should get it, and then these few will have large savings for the purpose of development.

So I say we differ: We talk together but each one of us decided how best to bring about development in our respective countries. And we have chosen our own way of moving on, step by step, all of us moving together without having one group leaving another behind. This is what we are striving to do.

So I say there are countries that understand our system and they assist us. There are others, and, in addition, some international organizations that oppose us: I wish they would just oppose and then leave us alone and subsequently desist completely from interfering in our affairs. But, unfortunately, they are interfering in our affairs and provoking us. They give us unrealistic advice and we reject it.

Some of the advice they give us is completely unrealistic. In English it is known as devaluation, that is, to devaluate the Tanzanian shilling is to reduce its value. Eight Tanzanian shillings are equivalent to one U.S. dollar. That is, in order to get one U.S. dollar with which to buy something abroad you have to pay 8 Tanzanian shillings. Now we have been given this advice: We have been told to devalue the Tanzanian shilling by half its present value; so that if I want 1 dollar, I should spend 16 shillings. Yes, 16 shillings to get the dollar to buy what you need.

But we said this unrealistic. How does it help us? They said: If you did that, you will be able to give farmers [words indistinct]. I think it is appropriate to explain this to the farmers. They think that peoples are fools.

They said: Now you see your cotton and get a dollar for it. That dollar is equivalent to 8 shillings. So society gets 8 shillings, that being the price of the cotton. After society deducts all its costs what is left behind as a balance is given to the farmer. For instance, if you spend 4 shillings on expenses, the balance of 4 shillings will be given to the farmers.

Now their argument is: If you devalue the shilling, and if you still sell the same amount of cotton then you will still get the same dollar; but that dollar now will bring 16 shillings instead of 8 at the central bank. Now, from the 16 shillings, you will deduct expenses and the balance will be given to the farmer. So that, if from the 8 shillings, you gave him 4, now it will be possible from the 16 to give him 8 or 10. And so if you do this, the farmer will get more money.

This is what they are saying. And if you explain it in this manner, people will be very happy, and they might say, this is a useless government. Why is it stopping us from getting more money?

But it is not difficult to understand how silly this is. First, you would reduce the value of the shilling by devaluating it. So each of the 16 shillings will be equivalent to 50 cents. So what have you really gained? For, truly speaking, if people were to get rich by doing this, why should I make it only 16 shillings? I could make it 40, [laughter] and by so doing Tanzanians would become very rich. But their cotton is still the same quantity. This is a way of misleading people, because your shilling is no longer a shilling but is only worth 50 cents.

And then think of gasoline. We buy it with dollars. Therefore, every dollar for buying gasoline will cost 16 shillings. Think of spare parts we buy. Each spare part for tractors which used to cost 8 shillings will now cost 16 shillings. Consider any other items from abroad. Each one that used to cost 8 shillings now costs 16. Now tell me, what have you really given the farmer? This is one thing that we completely reject. We say: We do not agree with devaluing our currency.

This is not the only thing they are telling us. They say first devalue your currency, and this means increase the expense here of importing goods from abroad. Then they tell us not to increase anybody's salary. I am deliberately telling you this because these people want to confuse us. And they have begun interfering with my leaders who become confused believing that these people are talking sense, when in fact they are talking nonsense.

They have been advising: First, reduce the value of your currency; and secondly, they tell us not to increase salaries (?by force). They are still blaming us for increasing salaries. I am saying this publicly, so that they may respond.

They say we must reduce the value of our money so if a person earns 400 shillings, this money should actually be half of this, and on top of that we must not increase his salary to offset devaluation.

The third thing they want us to do is to abolish the price commission, so that prices may increase. I am saying all this because I want you to know the type of advice given to us and why we reject such advice. And then they move around complaining to you that your leaders reject good guidelines, for if they had accepted our advice, the country's economy would have improved. This is precisely their advice. Very foolish advice.

Their fourth proposal: Increase bank interest now. So when you get a loan from a bank, expenses should go up. This is the fourth. Five: At present we only import goods we want and those we import are imported for the sake of our economy. They say we should remove this restriction on importation so that when people import goods, they can import any goods without any restrictions. We rejected this. All these things we have turned down.

This is what we have rejected and this is what they are complaining about in Dar es Salaam to our leaders in the party and government. This is what they are grumbling about, and they are saying: These are the good proposals we are making to your leaders and they are rejecting them. Such are their proposals.

We say: If they cannot assist us, they should go back home and stay there. I am saying all this so party and government leaders may think about these things, so that you may ponder over them and over what they mean.

I want you to ask yourselves whether we agreed to devalue Tanzania's currency. They say this is beneficial for Tanzania; I want to know the benefits. Secondly; we must not increase salaries. First reduce the value of their shilling--take for instance the minimum wage of 480 shillings and reduce its value--then do not increase their salary to offset the devaluation.

Thirdly [as heard], there must not be anyone to control prices so that he does not question the increase in prices. Let prices go up freely. They say: What manpower do you have to control prices? So let prices go up, then they will find their own levels and will remain there and stabilize. So do not interfere with commodity prices.

The fourth proposal: Increase interest on loans and by so doing farmers--and these people [those giving the advice] like the farmers nowadays and I have never seen them so fond of them before--would get an incentive to keep their money in the bank.

But where do these people come from? When a Tanzanian farmer gets his money, he needs things that are in the shops. If the commodities he needs are available in the shops, he will go and buy them. If they are not there, he might buy cattle. If this is not possible, he goes and gets married.

Even if you increase interest, a farmer may not do that. What will make him put his money in the bank is to send the bank nearer to him. But to bring the bank closer to him costs more money, and this is what they have advised us against. They keep on saying: Do not use more money. He may, after buying a cow and some commodities from the shop, and, if he acquires a second wife and if he still has some savings, he may bank it if there is a bank nearby. And when he keeps his money there, he is doing this purely for security reasons. He does not look to any benefits that might accrue.

Our advisers come from abroad. And we tell them that we Tanzanians understand the situation here. We understand them better than you may ever do. When he banks his money he does so because this is a safer place to keep his money. And when he wants the money to multiply he will buy cattle. So this issue of increasing interest has been rejected.

These are the real issues of our argument with them. These are the major points of disagreement and I am mentioning them so that party and government leaders and my colleagues who may have been misled there in the background understand this so-called good advice and why we reject it and reject their arguments about the reasons behind our state of our economy. All this is not true.

It is not true that we are given wonderful advice and then reject it. They merely want to confuse us. Well, consider all the advice I have mentioned, all five proposals. They are meant to hurt the small man.

These are proposals to mislead us about our aims and I am explaining them deliberately because when it comes to the aim, the aim is ours, all of us--Tanzanian peasants and Tanzanian workers--we must all understand it. And when someone wants to divert us we must all, collectively, reject the diversion. [applause]

I am explaining this so that you may understand it. One does not have to be an expert to understand this. This is all misleading but it is better for the party and its affiliated unions to understand all this so you may discuss it. Discuss all the proposals they are giving us.

So countrymen, we reject them. And we reject them completely. [applause] And they say: If you reject them, you will not get our money. I am saying: These threats, countrymen, will harm us and it is better that we turn them down. Let us understand each other in a civilized manner and understand that there are limits to fighting among adults; as adults we cannot threaten each other like children.

So I am saying: If they can assist us, let them assist us. If they want to, then that's that. But, countrymen, there are countries in the world which are our friends and which understand our policy and accept it. Others, though they may understand it, do not accept it, but they are honest people and we trust each other.

Still others understand our policy but reject it. They want to use various ways to confuse us. And now they see us in difficulty and it is people in difficulty whom you can squeeze and force to change course.

When someone is in difficulty, that is when he can be separated from his convictions.

It is only when times are hard that you will know who is steadfast. When all is going well you cannot tell who is steadfast and who is not. Only during a period of difficulty will you know which country has a stance and which one does not.

There are ill-intentioned people who say: We have now got the Tanzanians. During this period of difficulty there are many we can get. So I am giving them this pledge on your behalf. [applause] I give this pledge on your behalf: I am telling them that problems have good and bad effects. Human beings prosper under problems and without problems one cannot prosper.

There are people outside who are using our problems as a yardstick to assess our abilities. They say: Tanzanians are facing a problem. Will they overcome it or not? I pledge, on your behalf, that we shall succeed because what we decided on was not decided as a joke. We decided it only after much thought and deliberation. We resolved what type of society we wanted to build. We know that we differ from others in the world and that some of them are big people and extremely rich. But we still say we shall strive to build a socialist country. There are problems but we shall still build a socialist country. They want to distract us. We say we shall not be distracted.

They say that if we do not agree to abandon our aims they will not give us their money. I wish to say that the responsibility of feeding Tanzanians is the duty of Tanzanians. There is no one outside Tanzania who has that obligation. We thank all our friends who assist us very much, but the duty of feeding Tanzanians remains a duty of Tanzanians themselves.

We cannot divest ourselves of and pass on this responsibility to someone else. The responsibility of getting foreign currency for the development we want and the reduction of dependence on others is our duty. And to those who assist us, we wish to express our gratitude. Very often our friends assist us by seeing and knowing our stand. This is what makes them assist us. Many of them tell us: Do not be swayed. If you sway you will, in turn, make us sway. Ours is the struggle and ours is the goal.

To get foreign exchange for our development is our obligation, and this, at present, is the task of Tanzanian peasants. The duty of feeding this nation is a duty, more often than not, that rests on the peasants of this country. They are the ones who grow and feed themselves and the surplus is given to us who work in the urban areas to provide services. But those feeding this nation are the peasants themselves. I call on Tanzanian peasants to strive to increase these efforts to feed our nation and feed ourselves. We cannot give this job to anyone else.

I also call on workers, as they perform many services required by farmers. Every worker, whereever he is, should fulfill his obligation so that we may help each other, with the peasants, to get enough food and enough money.

Countrymen, I say we have these problems and they are great. They are not small problems and we are not alone in facing them. They are problems facing Third World countries, especially those that do not have oil. They have enormous problems; but there are among those, poor countries that are relatively better off--those that follow a socialist policy. [applause] These big people do not want this advantage to be seen. And that is why they like to confuse such countries. I wish to say that we shall do everything possible not to be confused but to continue, step by step, to build a country of equality.

Thank you very much, countrymen. [applause]

CAMEROON

AHIDJO AFFIRMS NIGERIAN BORDER REGION CALM

AB072036 Yaounde Domestic Service in English 1830 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] President Ahmadou Ahidjo described as unfounded and dangerous foreign reports that there is an outbreak of hostilities along the Nigeria-Cameroon border.

In an interview with the semi-official daily, CAMEROON TRIBUNE, published today, President Ahmadou Ahidjo affirmed that calm has now returned to the border area, adding that Cameroon will not be at the orgin of any eventual conflict with its neighbors. He (?also) expressed Cameroon's readiness to participate in any mediation efforts.

President Ahmadou Ahidjo said he was not insisting on the issue to avoid aggravating the situation. But he recalled that after the May 16 border clash with the Nigerian Navy in Cameroonian waters, a powerful delegation headed by the minister of state for foreign affairs was sent to Lagos to present Cameroon's regrets to the berieved families and to propose the creation of a mixed commission to examine the issue. Unfortunately, that (?offer) along with the proposed negotiations by some heads of state failed, he added.

The Nigerian Government, on the contrary, had preferred to take the border issue before the OAU heads of state summit in Nairobi, Kenya, declining to engage in [words indistinct].

ZAIRE

AZAP TERMS BELGIAN REFUGEE POLICY 'FACADE'

AB071000 Kinshasa AZAP in French 1600 GMT 6 Jul 81

[Text] Kinshasa, 6 Jul (AZAP)--The founding chairman of the MPR and president of the republic held a meeting at Gbadolite of several of his main advisers for the purpose of examining the situation which prevails at the moment between Zaire and the Kingdom of Belgium. Present with the president of the republic were the dean of the Central Committee of the MPR, the permanent secretary of the Political Bureau, the first state commissioner, the deputy first state commissioner and commissioner of foreign affairs and international cooperation, the special adviser to the chief of state charged with security and the director of the president's office.

You will remember that on 30 June 1981, the founding chairman of the MPR and president of the republic presided over a large gathering of the people at Kinkole and on that occasion the guide of the Zairian revolution addressed, in clear and straightforward terms, the political, economic and social situation in our country, particularly in light of the most recent decisions made by the Central Committee of the MPR during its second ordinary session.

Dealing especially with the relations between Zaire and its partners, the founding chairman reaffirmed the Executive Council's firm desire to maintain relations of friendship and cooperation with all countries desiring peace and having good will.

On this subject, it was noted that in general, things are well; a black mark has arisen, however, in relations between the Republic of Zaire and the Kingdom of Belgium, and this was vigorously noted by the founding chairman.

More precisely, it is a matter of the protection that Belgian (?authorities) give campaigns of denigration that are launched and lead by Zairian refugees in Belgium against the institutions of our country.

Now, the Executive Council has asked the Belgium Government several times about the law on Zairian expatriates who have taken refuge in Belgium for political reasons.

1. At the time of the visit to Kinshasa of former Prime Minister Wilfred Martens last February and March this question of the law on Zairian refugees living in Belgium was raised.

2. Most recently, when returning from a mission in the United States, the deputy first commissioner of state and commissioner of state for foreign affairs and international cooperation held long discussions on the same question with the present Belgian prime minister, Mr Eyskens, as well as with the Belgian ministers of foreign affairs and of justice.

The Belgian side, in spite of its promises, has never furnished the Zairian side with satisfactory answers on this question.

In the meantime, these Zairian refugees in Belgium continue to enjoy total freedom of action, allowing certain of them to take trips outside Belgium with the aim of obtaining arms and all other means to make an attempt against the security of Zaire while others were able, just as freely, in plain sight of and with the knowledge of the Belgian Government and with the support of certain nostalgic people from the former secessionist state of Katanga, to go about recruiting mercenaries whose mission is to carry out commando operations on Zairian soil.

In order to put an end to this situation which has lasted too long, the Executive Council--through the voice of the founding chairman of the MPR and president of the republic--had urged the Belgian Government to give appropriate answers to some fundamental questions and reveal the legal status of the Zairian nationals who took refuge in Belgium and to disclose whether the latter could set up political associations and undertake, from the host country, subversive actions against their country of origin.

The council had then said that if it did not receive an answer before Monday, 6 July at 1200, it would sever diplomatic relations with Belgium.

Following its public denouncement by the Zairian Government, the Belgian Government--no doubt aware of the seriousness of the situation--met and made the important decisions that everybody knows.

Concerning those decisions, Zaire, which is loyal to the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other states, finds that it does not have to overappreciate them. However,

1. Zaire takes note of all the good intentions voiced by the Belgium Government to see to it that from now on Zairian nationals settled in Belgium do not indulge in inciting violence against their country, nor in campaigns of denigration against their country's institutions and in offenses against their head of state.

2. Zaire feels that it is through its actions that the real intentions and good faith of the Belgian Government can be judged.

For, unfortunately, it is not in vain to recall that since the ascension of our country to independence right up to this present day, cooperation between Zaire and Belgium has not always been frank in the minds of our former colonial masters.

And every day the reality of the facts reduces to zero this policy of facade that the Belgian Government has adopted with regard to Zaire.

The legislation that the Belgian Government has just instituted recently on the status of foreigners living in Belgium is yet another proof that, in the opinion of certain Belgian officials competent in the matter, nothing clearly and absolutely protects the countries of origin from acts and statements which their nationals might make from Belgian territory.

Consequently, faced with this ambigious policy, Zaire can only accept the latest measures taken by the Belgian Government with the strongest reservations and remains attentive to the actual application of these measures. And when the moment comes, if necessary, Zaire will assume its full responsibilities without any other preliminary procedures.

GHANA

MEASURES TAKEN TO END TRIBAL DISPUTE IN NORTH

AB072030 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The government has banned the possession or the carrying of arms and ammunitions and other offensive weapons in the Nanumba, eastern Gonja and Krachi districts until further notice. Members of the armed forces on duty, police officers on duty or any other person duly authorized in writing by the minister of the interior are, however, exempted from the ban. All persons or group of persons in possession of any kind of arms and ammunition are to deposit them at the nearest police station.

According to the instrument, ammunition includes explosives, all ammunitions of war, and all materials for loading fire arms; arms include firearms and offensive weapons of all description, artillery, apparatus for the discharge of all kinds of projectiles, explosives or gas difusing flamethrowers, bombs, grenades, machineguns and rifles small bore, breach-loading weapons of all kinds and all parts of those weapons; firearms include any single or double barrel shot gun, rifle, machinegun, cap gun, flintlock gun, pistol, revolver, cannon or any other firearm and any airgun, air rifle or air pistol, whether whole or in detached pieces. And an offensive weapon means an article made or adapted for use for causing injury to a person or intended by the person having it for use by him; under this category falls bows and arrows, spears, cudgels and cutlasses.

In addition to the publication of the instrument, more military personnel and policemen have been sent to the areas of conflict to keep the peace and maintain law and order and to arrest any person or persons disturbing the public peace.

The government has also declared the area a disaster area and has consequently set up a national relief committee to coordinate and monitor relief activities in connection with the Namumba-Konkomba clashes. The committee, which is under the chairmanship of the minister for presidential affairs, Dr Nabila, is made up of representatives from Ministries of Labor and Social Welfare, Interior, Defense, Transport and Communications, Health, Information and Tourism and any other relief agencies in the country.

The committee has arranged for the Ghana Air Force to airlift food donated by the Catholic relief services from Takoradi to Tamale for onward transmission to the affected areas tomorrow.

Food from the emergency relief stock will also be airlifted from Accra to the affected areas on Thursday.

In the meantime, the government is carrying out consultations with the northern and upper region houses of chiefs, youth associations and opinion leaders from the affected areas in order to find a lasting solution to the conflict. The government wishes to make it clear that steps are being taken to bring the conflict to a peaceful end.

Earlier, Parliament expressed its grave concern over the conflict and called on the government as a matter of urgency to declare the affected areas a disaster zone and take immediate steps to provide the relief services to the victims. The government should also launch a national appeal for further relief aid to the victims and appoint a commission of inquiry to investigate the causes of the conflict with a view to restoring peace and harmony in the area.

An urgent motion to this effect by the member for Lawra Nandom, Mr (Gandaah), was adopted. Members appealed to both sides in the conflict to lay down their arms. Some members were not happy about the failure of the president to make any public pronouncements on the conflict. They were of the view that a word or two from the president could have cooled down tempers of the warring factions. The members were also not happy about the silence of the members of the council of state over the issue. They appealed to them to take urgent steps before the situation gets out of hand.

At this point, it was disclosed by the first deputy speaker, Mr Mahami, that President Limann will visit the area on Saturday. Moving his motion, Mr Gandaah, who was the leader of a four-man fact-finding team of parliamentarians from the northern and upper regions, said there is a strong distrust between the Konkombas and Nanumbas with regard to their safety and each other's intentions. He noted that each side to the conflict stated its case with full conviction of the justice of its cause and said since their delegation did not have the time and means to investigate fully the remote causes of the conflict, it is hoped that a commission of inquiry will lead to the finding of a long-term solution of the conflict.

A suggestion was made to increase the military and police personnel in the affected areas. The registration of voters in those areas should also be suspended until peace and security are restored.

DAILY GRAPHIC Comment

AB072040 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Press review]

[Text] The DAILY GRAPHIC comments on the latest developments in the clashes between the Konkombas and the Nanumbas in the northern region. According to reports, anonymous posters circulating in Tamale give Konkombas living there up to 4 days to leave or see revolutionary justice. Landlords were also warned to desist from giving shelter to the Konkombas or face the same fate.

The GRAPHIC expresses great concern about this latest dimension in the crisis and recommends to the government to declare a state of emergency in all the danger zones in the area to enable the armed forces to deal swiftly with all culprits. The paper also recommends that those responsible for criminal acts should be tracked down and punished.

The GRAPHIC calls on the government to investigate the allegations that a neighboring country is actively engaged in sowing trouble in the area.

STATE SUGAR FACTORIES CLOSE DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS

AB071032 Paris AFP in English 0723 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Accra, 7 Jul (AFP)--Ghana's only two state sugar factories, the country's main suppliers, have closed down indefinitely because of lack of funds to pay for labour, a factories spokesman said here Monday. He said there also was a shortage of spare parts of repairing machinery and vehicles.

A request by the directorate board to government for 60 million cedis (some 21 million dollars) toward this year's operating costs had received no official ministry response, the spokesman reported.

The two factories together had been allocated only one million cedis for import licenses last year out of an application for 14 millions, he added.

Constraints on the factories had reduced production capacity to a mere 20 per cent for the past four years. In present conditions, more than 1,200 workers had been retrenched at one of the factories until a government subsidy was provided to restore operational costs to normal, the spokesman said.

IVORY COAST

PLANNED STRIKE BY DOCTORS UNION CALLED OFF

AB071059 Abidjan FRATERNITE MATIN in French 7 Jul 81 p 1

[Text] Yesterday morning Ivorians were happily informed through the national radio that the doctors' strike, which was planned for that very day, was called off. Our colleagues had received a phone call from the Bureau of the Synacassci announcing the cancellation. The medical cadres, members of the Synacassci, have thus shown great maturity and remarkable patriotism by following the recommendations of the Political Bureau of the PDCI-RDA [Democratic Party of the Ivory Coast-African Democratic Rally].

Therefore, let us once again praise the virtues of dialogue, for were it elsewhere things would have occurred differently. There would surely have been arrests and probably executions. With us, we will never witness such events as long as we can use the arm of dialogue. Has not our head of state sworn not to ever pour blood on the soil of our beloved motherland?

By deciding to delay their strike, the medical doctors thus continue the dialogue in an atmosphere of serenity. This honors them. All their Ivorian brothers rejoice with them for that decision, which is the fruit of great maturity.

NIGERIA

PAPER CONDEMNS U.S. ATTITUDE ON SOUTH AFRICA

AB071022 Lagos International Service in English 0930 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Press review]

[Excerpt] The NIGERIAN STATESMAN condemns the attitude of the United States to efforts at achieving majority rule in South Africa. The paper is unhappy that the Reagan administration is putting to test Nigeria's prominent role on the issue as demonstrated in her foreign policy objectives. The STATESMAN advises the United States not to see her support for repressive regimes as the best way of countering Soviet presence in Africa or anywhere in the world.

LAGOS COMMENTS ON CHOICE OF TRIPOLI AS OAU VENUE

AB080828 Lagos Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 8 Jul 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] No clear-cut pattern seems to have emerged on the choice of venue of OAU summit meetings. There was a time when the feeling was rife that the venue must rotate alphabetically among the member states. This plan was, however, fraught with all kinds of problems. One is that there are obviously some states which cannot meet the financial implications of hosting the OAU summit. Such states would prefer to wait, for the time being, until when they can take on that sort of responsibility. To a few states, the immediate constraint is that given the chance to host the summit now, they've just not got the necessary facilities like a fairly standard conference center, hotel facilities and international telecommunication links. Of course, there are some states which will not host the meeting for temporary political and security exigencies. It is not surprising, therefore, that the OAU has been flexible about the choice of venue of the organization's summits. The practice for some time now is for any country willing to host the heads of state meeting to signify its intention. Once the majority of the members accept the proposal, the country is given the green light to prepare for the conference.

The method adopted in the case of Libya is not any different. During the last summit in Nairobi, Kenya, that country made it known that she was willing to host next year's summit. Sudan and Egypt were some of the countries that seriously opposed the hosting of the meeting by Libya. A majority of the members did not make any objection and so it was decided that Libya could host the meeting. Now, a few weeks after the conference has ended, there has been some controversy over the choice of Tripoli as the next venue of the OAU summit meeting. Senegal has indicated that her delegation will not attend the meeting if the present Libyan policy posture remains the same. Political analysts have so far taken the statement from the Senegalese as a sign of more problems to come.

They foresee many more countries virtually boycotting the summit. Precisely, those countries are complaining against some Libyan policies which appear to be most unconventional in terms of international relations. One of such policies was the sudden decision by Libya to transform its embassies abroad into what it calls the people's bureaus. Many countries, including Nigeria, Ghana and even the Republic of China, closed down the embassies until Libya is prepared to run them strictly along the lines of the existing international protocols and conventions guarding diplomatic relations among countries. There are still some nations which have found Libya's support for revolutionary movements in different parts of the world too much for their liking. As a matter of fact, there are states which have alleged that Libya is a haven for terrorists.

Yet another problem area is the current role being played by Libya in the Chadian crisis. The presence of her troops in Chad is objectionable to the states sharing boundaries with the country. The term that is being freely used is that the Libyan military campaign in Chad is expansionist in its orientation. All these factors taken together seem to be working toward a poor attendance at the Tripoli meeting of the OAU next year.

And without much hesitation, the United States has joined the bandwagon of the countries calling for the shifting of the venue of the summit from Tripoli to another place. But while so much doubt is being expressed about the possibility of Libya hosting the meeting, many African leaders today consider the American view as interventionist and so, uncalled for.

Be that as it may, the Libyans themselves are fighting back and they seem to be bent on hosting the meeting in spite of the objections being raised in some quarters. For them, the charges being levied against their country are untenable. Perhaps what is more important is that the OAU Secretariat has to study the issue more carefully. A few years back, a similar crisis was averted in the case of Uganda hosting the OAU summit under Field Marshal Idi Amin. On this occasion, the organization should also find a solution that will ensure that all the members attend the next summit wherever it is held.

NPP ANNOUNCES PLANS TO END WORKING ACCORD WITH NPN

AB070841 Lagos Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The Nigerian People's Party, NPP, says it will, as from the 3d of January next year, pull out of the working accord between it and the National Party of Nigeria, NPN. Also, on that day the party plans to withdraw all its ministers from the Federal Government.

The national chairman of the NPP, Chief Adeniran Ogunsanya, who announced this indication at a news conference in Lagos yesterday, said his party has already given notice of its intention to disentangle itself from the pact.

SOUTH AFRICA

JOHANNESBURG REPORTS ON SWAPO AMBUSH, DEATHS

LD071204 Johannesburg International Service in English 1100 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] Security forces in northern South-West Africa-Namibia have shot and killed 13 armed SWAPO terrorists. The officer commanding the South-West African Territorial Force, Maj Gen Charles Lloyd, said the terrorists were killed in a short but fierce skirmish near (?Etale) in central Ovambo, when a security force patrol walked into an ambush set by the terrorists. Arms, ammunition and equipment were seized during the counterattack. General Lloyd added that security forces suffered no losses. The latest clash brought to 65 the number of terrorists killed in the past 5 days.

ZAMBIA

KAUNDA RECEIVES CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTER 2 JUL

CA031322 Lusaka Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 2 Jul 81

[Text] President Kaunda has said that Zambia has great admiration and respect for Cuban President Fidel Castro for his commitment to the cause of mankind. Dr Kaunda said this at State House today when visiting Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs Isidoro Malmierca delivered a special message from President Castro. Dr Kaunda said the Cuban revolution turned out because the leader of that country was committed to the cause of his people and mankind as a whole. President Kaunda described President Castro as a friend and fellow freedom fighter, recalling that during the 1979 Nonaligned Conference held in Havana they had difficult times but that a lot was achieved because of his chairmanship.

ZIMBABWE

AID FOR LIBERATION MOVEMENTS TO GO THROUGH OAU

CA080926 Salisbury Domestic Service in English 0400 GMT 7 Jul 81

[Text] The prime minister, Comrade Mugabe, says Zimbabwe will provide assistance to the liberation movement in southern Africa through the OAU. In an interview with a London magazine, AMBASSADOR INTERNATIONAL, Comrade Mugabe said this country cannot provide direct aid to these organizations because it does not want to give aprtheid-ruled South Africa a pretext for confrontation with Zimbabwe. He said: We do believe that our success here will be promotive of this trend in South Africa and that it will also consolidate the independence achieved in Mozambique, Zambia, Angola and Botswana. Comrade Mugabe said, if the Pretoria regime resisted change then the armed struggle will be intensified.